

[Mr. T. E. Moir]

[28th March 1928]

we should be entirely at the mercy of growers in Java and elsewhere. That is why so much attention has been paid in recent years by the Government of India and by the Local Government to grow cinchona to meet local needs to as large an extent as possible, as otherwise we should be entirely at the mercy of other suppliers. But that, Sir, has nothing to do with the question of distribution. The price which is credited to the Cinchona department is fixed with reference to the world's market price from time to time by the Government of India and it is with reference to that figure that the commercial results are judged. It is solely to enable us to increase the supply that this money is asked for. The question whether either free supply of quinine should be made or whether prices should be fixed at some figure below the cost price is a quite different one and really concerns either the Medical department or the department of Public Health. But neither of these departments is concerned in the present demand."

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

Mr. J. A. SALDANHA :—"I beg to oppose this grant for the very reason just explained by the hon. the Finance Member. I think the whole basis and the system of the Cinchona department is wrong for this reason : that the Government are spending large sums of money and are not growing this for free distribution in the malarial areas for which Rs. 95,000 is provided this year. The hon. the Minister for Public Health said some months ago that Rs. 4 lakhs would be provided every year for free distribution of quinine. I do not see any reason why the Cinchona department should not be carried on on a philanthropic basis, though it must be done in a business-like manner. Instead of the roundabout method of the Government of India or some department managing it, why not place the cinchona plantations and the quinine produce of the plantations and the factories connected with it at the disposal of the department of Public Health."

\* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—"The hon. Member is not in order in raising all those points on this demand."

\* Mr. J. A. SALDANHA :—"I say that the system is wrong and for the reasons which I have given, I oppose this grant."

The demand was put and carried and the grant was made.

#### IV

#### FURTHER DEMANDS FOR GRANTS FOR 1928-29.

##### DEMAND IV—FOREST.

\* The hon. Mr. A. Y. G. CAMPBELL :—"On the recommendation of His Excellency the Governor, I move

*'that the Government be granted a sum not exceeding Rs. 1,26,300 under Demand IV—Forest'*

to provide for certain experiments in the Anamalai forests."

\* Mr. S. SATYAMURTI :—"On a point of order, Sir, I want to raise, with your leave, what I consider a very important point for your ruling, viz., that these further demands—I shall rather confine it to this demand—that this further demand is out of order under the Government of India Act, the rules framed thereunder, and the Standing Orders under which we are working. I quite recognize that for the last eight years in this House we have been allowing these further demands. As against that, I may be permitted to submit to you that neither in the Assembly nor in the other Provincia

28th March 1928]

[Mr. S. Satyamurti]

Councils are allowed further demands of this character. As a matter of fact—I speak subject to correction, but I think I am correct in stating that—it is not made in any other legislature.”

\* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—“If the hon. Member makes that statement after referring to the proceedings, we have to take it.”

\* Mr. S. SATYAMURTI :—“I make that statement, so far as I have been able to verify it. This particular further demand must be decided by reference to the Government of India Act, the rules made thereunder and the Standing Orders. May I first invite your attention to section 72-D of the Government of India Act under which we discuss the budget in this House? You will find in section 72-D, clause (2), ‘the estimated annual expenditure and revenue of the Province shall be laid in the form of a statement before the Council in each year, and the proposals of the Local Government for the appropriation of the Provincial revenues and other money in any year shall be submitted to the vote of the Council in the form of demands for grants’. I lay some emphasis, Mr. President, on the words ‘in any year’. The budget which is presented to us is the proposal of the Local Government for the appropriation of Provincial revenues and other moneys for the whole year. Then, Sir, it goes on to say, ‘shall be submitted to the vote of the Council in the form of demands for grants’. That has been done in the original statement presented to us by the hon. the Finance Member and now we are having demands for grants under the various heads. That is so far as the Act is concerned, Mr. President, and there are some provisions made in our rules in regard to other matters about those grants. Before I go to them, may I invite your attention to 72-D, clause (5), which gives the Government of India the power to make rules? That is at page 59. ‘Provision may be made by rules under this Act for the purpose of carrying into effect the foregoing provisions of this section.’ I want to invite your attention to the object of this rule; it should be to carry into effect the foregoing provision of this section, *inter alia*, the provision, namely, that the proposal of the Local Government for the appropriation of Provincial revenues in any year shall be submitted to the vote of the Council. Secondly, it is ‘for regulating the course of business in the Council’. For these two purposes, the rules are framed. Sir, the rules governing our budget grants are rules 25, *et seq.* Rule 25, Sir, defines the budget as a statement of the estimated annual expenditure and revenue of the Province, and says it shall be presented to the Council on such day as the Governor may appoint. That, 11-45 a.m. I submit, Sir, has been done. It was early this month that the Finance Member presented to this Council on the day appointed by the Governor a statement of the annual expenditure and revenue of the Province. Then, rule 26 gives the Finance Member the power to arrange the demands for grants and the items thereunder, subject to certain rules which I need not trouble you with. Sub-rules (1) and (2) merely specify the form of the demands for grants, but sub-rule (3) says, ‘Subject to these rules, the budget shall be presented in such a form as the Finance Member may consider best fitted for its consideration by the Council’. Therefore, I submit, the question is this : are these further demands part of the budget for the year or not? If they are part of the budget, they should have been presented on the day on which the budget was presented in the form approved and



[Mr. S. Satyamurti]

[28th March 1928]

recommended by the hon. the Finance Member, subject to the provisions of sub-rules (1) and (2) of rule 26. That having been done, there is no power in the Finance Member or in the Executive Government to present before us what amounts really to a further budget. You may call them further demands for grants, but it simply means a further budget. I may pause for one moment and say that if these are to be allowed,—you have got to test it by an extreme instance—there is nothing to prevent the Finance Member or the Executive Government presenting 365 budgets on the 365 days of the year. If the Council are in session, they could always present a budget for Rs. 100 in the first instance and go on making further demands, day after day saying that they are further demands and therefore they are part of the budget. If the budget therefore means anything, it means, subject to the rule to which I shall presently refer governing the supplementary demands and excess demands, that there must be one budget for the whole year.

“Then, Sir, with regard to this rule itself, I want to invite your attention to sub-clause (2) which says, ‘Each demand shall contain, first, a statement of the total grant proposed’. Therefore, these demands must contain, according to the rules, the total grant required by the Executive Government for each demand. That they have done, and they cannot now add to the total except under the provisions made in these rules themselves. Therefore, I submit first for your consideration the point that these further demands must either form part of the budget, in which case they are too late, or they are not part of the budget, in which case, they cannot be presented except in the form of excess grants or supplementary demands.

“Then, I would invite your attention to rule 27 which gives this House the right to a general discussion of the whole budget. Now, Sir, we are deprived, as a Council, of the right of general discussion with regard to these further demands. That right may be either illusory or may be substantial according to the opinions of hon. Members here, but so far as you are concerned, you are only concerned with the rights of this House. So far as these further demands are concerned,—and if I may say so in passing, these demands amount to roughly over Rs. 8 lakhs—I may be a little mistaken this side or that—and inasmuch as 8 lakhs of rupees is being asked for from this House as further demands, they deprive the House *ex hypothesi* of its right to discuss the whole principles of the budget as part of the general discussion on those days set apart for it. As my hon. Friend Mr. Venkataramana Ayyangar reminds me, there is nothing in our rules or Standing Orders to restrict the extent or nature of these further demands, if they be held to be in order by you. They can put down further demands for eight crores to-morrow, because there is nothing in our rules or Standing Orders preventing excessive further demands.

“Then, the voting also is truncated, because when we discuss and vote upon demands for grants, we do not know what is the total which is required for each demand for grant. That total is not given here as in the budget demands.

“Then I want to make before you one submission. This budget must be one and indivisible; the budget for the year must not be a piecemeal budget. In this connexion I invite your attention to Durell’s ‘Parliamentary

28th March 1928]

[Mr. S. Satyamurti]

Procedure'; at page 47 it is stated: 'Apart from the annual estimates and grants, for consolidated fund services already alluded to, Parliament may be asked for supplementary grants, excess grants, exceptional grants or votes of credit.'

"Then I come to May's 'Parliamentary Practice'. All the passages there depend only on the Standing Order. All the additional demands with which I have been able to acquaint myself were demands the need for which arose after 31st March. You know, Sir, that in the House of Commons, unlike in the Madras Legislative Council, the voting of demands goes on till 5th August next year. I can give one instance at once. The latest demand to which I might refer was the demand which arose owing to an agreement with regard to coal subsidies or something of that kind between the English Government and some other Government, on the 16th July. I suggest, Sir, according to Durell, they are the only estimates and grants which are presented before the Parliament. So far as further demands are concerned, if they are going to be treated, as they have been treated here, as customary and as a matter of course, the objections to supplementary estimates which Durell mentions applies to them also; 'supplementary estimates when treated as customary, and as a matter of course instead of being restricted to the occasions of unforeseen contingencies, do more to destroy effectual Parliamentary control than any other.' I submit that if demands for Rs. 8 lakhs are going to be placed before us without any previous notice as provided for with regard to the budget, except the two days' notice which luckily the Standing Orders have provided for, it looks as if the House is sought to be deprived of effectual control over these comparatively large sums of money. I want to invite your attention to Todd's 'Parliamentary Practice,' and particularly to a statement of Mr. Gladstone, with regard to the nature of the budget as a whole. Todd refers to it with approval. 'Though very plausible in theory,' this is Mr. Gladstone's statement, 'though not in practice, nothing tended so much to defeat the efficacy of Parliamentary control as the easy resort to supplementary estimates. To render this control effectual, it was necessary that the House of Commons should have the money transactions of the year presented to it *in one mass and in one account*. If it is to be a set of current transactions varying from time to time, the House would never know where it was. If supplementary estimates were easily and frequently resorted to, the House would be obliged in self-defence to appoint a permanent finance committee.' The one sentence that I will lay stress on is this: 'It is necessary that the House of Commons should have the money transactions of the year presented to it *in one mass and in one account*.' It is not being done here and as many as 38 further demands, for which I think the Governor had to be approached for giving another day, amounting roughly to Rs. 8 lakhs are going to be placed as a matter of course before this House.

"Then, we go on to the next rule (29), with regard to the allotment of days, which to my mind clinches the matter, if I may say so respectfully. 'Not more than twelve days shall be allotted by the Governor for the discussion of demands of the Local Government for grants'. Does this rule refer to further demands or does it not? If it does, supposing the Governor allots twelve days as he may for the discussion of ordinary demands, what becomes of the days for further demands? Can further days be allotted by him? Then, Sir, if this rule does not apply . . ."

[28th March 1928]

\* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" Instead of putting the question to the Chair, the hon. Member himself may answer as to whether the Government have got the power to allot days for further demands and supplementary demands."

\* Mr. S. SATYAMURTI :—" I am merely stating the question, Sir, pointing out the difficulty. I shall also suggest the answer. ' Not more than twelve days shall be allotted by the Governor for the discussion of demands of the Local Government for grants.' I submit, Sir, if you read that rule as you must, taking it along with the rules which precede that rule, that rule can apply only to the budget demands for grants. It only means that the demands for grants are presented by the Finance Member on the day fixed by the Governor for that purpose. It is only with regard to these demands for grants that the Governor can allot these twelve days; because, Sir, the allotment carried with it the disability on the part of the House to carry on the discussion of the vote upon the demands, to other days."

\* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" The Finance Member does not present any demands on the budget day but only a statement of the estimates of revenue and expenditure."

\* Mr. S. SATYAMURTI :—" The demands are circulated to us."

\* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" The demands are quite different from the budget presented."

\* Mr. S. SATYAMURTI :—" That distinction I recognize between the statement of the annual expenditure and revenue, and the demands themselves."

\* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" The items in the demands need not be identical with the items in the budget estimates."

\* Mr. S. SATYAMURTI :—" But the items are presented to us in time for us to give notice of amendments, and reduction or omission motions."

\* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" The notice of demands is given to the Members; it is not presented to the House. I am inclined to make a distinction between the presentation of the budget to the House and the giving of notice of demands to the Members of the Council in their capacity as members."

\* Mr. S. SATYAMURTI :—" I will invite your attention to the wording of the section. The wording is somewhat different, but I do not think it differs in substance. ' An estimate of the annual expenditure and revenue of the Province shall be laid in the form of a statement before the Council and the proposals shall be submitted to the vote of the Council '."

\* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" Notice of the proposals has been given and the proposals themselves are being placed before the Council for its vote during these days."

\* Mr. S. SATYAMURTI :—" But the proposals are placed before us before we begin giving notice of amendments."

\* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" The wording in rule 25 is ' A statement of the estimated annual expenditure and revenue of the Province (hereinafter referred to as ' the Budget ' shall be presented to the Council."

\* Mr. S. SATYAMURTI :—" But the wording in the section is ' laid in the form of a statement before the Council '. The rule says ' shall be presented."



28th March 1928]

[Mr. S. Satyamurti]

in the form of a statement'; with regard to demands, a demand has got to be formed and has got to be presented also. You will find in rule 26 (3), subject to these rules the budget shall be presented, etc."

\* The hon. the PRESIDENT:—"The budget is defined in rule 25."

\* Mr. S. SATYAMURTI:—"Clauses 1, 2 and 3 of rule 23 have got to be read together."

\* The hon. the PRESIDENT:—"The budget is defined in rule 25 and that is the sense in which the word is used. The demands are not the budget."

\* Mr. S. SATYAMURTI:—"The word 'budget' in rule 26 (3) must certainly refer to the demands; otherwise it can have no meaning."

\* The hon. the PRESIDENT:—"In what sense the word 'budget' is used, is clearly defined in rule 25."

\* Mr. S. SATYAMURTI:—"Rule 27 says: The budget shall be dealt with by the Council in two stages, namely, (i) a general discussion; and (ii) the voting of demands for grants. On the 30th again we will be dealing with the Budget. The voting of demands for grants is included in the budget, under rule 27. You will see, Sir, that the budget shall be dealt with by the Council in two stages, viz., general discussion and the voting of demands for grants. Therefore the budget includes the voting of demands for grants. Otherwise, rule 27 can have no meaning at all. So what we are having to-day is 'budget discussion'. That may be a colloquial phrase, but it is borne out by the wording of rule 27."

\* The hon. the PRESIDENT:—"Not to-day and to-morrow."

\* Mr. S. SATYAMURTI:—"As for to-day and to-morrow, it is neither here nor there, according to me. Now coming to the allotment of business, I was submitting to you, Sir, that the right to allot days, carries with it the serious right of empowering you as President of the House, on the appointed day and hour, to apply the guillotine, to the disability of the House beyond that day and hour to discuss the budget that is now discussed. Now, if the executive Government is allowed to introduce further demands and claim also the privilege of getting days allotted to it, it simply means that unlike supplementary grants, unlike excess grants, they can compel the House not to discuss them but only to vote. They may put forward eight crores under 130 further demands and have only one day allotted. I am not suggesting that the Governor will do it, but I want to test these things by an extreme instance."

\* The hon. the PRESIDENT:—"Where does the question of guillotine arise?"

\* Mr. S. SATYAMURTI:—"If I may anticipate that guillotine will not be applied in respect of these further demands, then this part of my argument fails. If, on the other hand, there is any meaning in the announcement made already in this House that two days have been allotted for these demands, it must carry with it the parliamentary implication of that word, viz., that if at the appointed day and at the appointed hour all these demands are not discussed and voted upon, guillotine will be applied and no further discussion but only voting can take place. It seems to me, Sir, that these further demands for grants cannot really come in and have the benefit of the privilege allowed to His Excellency the Governor to allot days. I may also say that, from the point of view of the House, if a conspectus of all these

12

noon.

[Mr. S. Satyamurti]

[28th March 1928]

demands had been given to the House earlier, we can, by arrangement among party leaders, try to skip over a great many intervening demands and reach a particular demand; whereas if the Executive Government keep back some heavy and very controversial items and bring them on the last day, the right of leaders of parties to reach that demand by arrangement among themselves is effectively destroyed by the Government. . . ."

\* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" Leaders of parties include the Leader of the House also."

\* Mr. S. SATYAMURTI :—" If the Leader of the Opposition wants that a particular demand should be reached, the Leader of the House must be willing enough to help the House."

\* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" How can the Leader of the House hold back any demand which the House wants to discuss by common agreement?"

\* Mr. S. SATYAMURTI :—" If it was in the original budget itself he is bound by parliamentary etiquette to oblige the leaders of parties to reach a particular demand in a particular grant. But the whole thing is kept back and comes up on the last day, in the form of further demands, whereby the chance of our doing so is denied."

" It is stated in sub-rule (2) of rule 29 'of the days so allotted, not more than two days shall be allotted by the Governor to the discussion of any one demand'. Do these grants come under this rule? As at present arranged, these two days have been allotted for the discussion of these further demands. Therefore it can only mean that His Excellency the Governor has set apart two official days. In the case of official business, if that business is not finished, it stands adjourned to the next official day. Then the question of guillotine cannot arise. If the guillotine does not apply, my humble submission to you, Sir, is that these further demands cannot be disposed of in these two days if they are to be discussed on their merits with all the amendments required."

\* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" Is it a point of order?"

\* Mr. S. SATYAMURTI :—" It will be stated by the Government that they are particularly anxious to bring forward before the House these extra items of expenditure rather than take the responsibility upon themselves of incurring the expenditure and coming forward with supplementary demands. I say unless the guillotine applies, that argument cannot apply, because there is no guarantee that any or all these demands will be passed in these two days. There is no point in bringing forward these demands now. In the House of Commons these further demands are also guillotined. On the last day of the estimates all outstanding additional demands, provided they have been presented two days before the last day, are guillotined. That point was exactly ruled by the Speaker and by the Chairman of Committees, that provided the Standing Order is satisfied and they are presented to the House, i.e., put in the order paper two days before the final day, they can be guillotined and they have been guillotined. Our procedure only means that the executive is being encouraged to bring forward these demands in the hope that they will somehow get them passed or will put them forward as supplementary demands afterwards."

28th March 1928]

\* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" Did the hon. Member note the new Standing Order 66-A ? "

\* Mr. S. SATYAMURTI :—" I am coming to that, Sir. The rules provide for this. I want to look at rules 31 and 32, the only other rules which provide with regard to these grants. Rule 31 deals with excess grants; rule 32 deals with supplementary or additional grants. Both these rules, as you know, none better, are governed by certain conditions. Suppose the Government want to bring forward an excess grant, I can raise a point of order under rule 31 whether there has been any excess of the amount granted for that year and ask for an explanation why the excess was incurred. With regard to supplementary demands they have got to satisfy you that the amount voted is found to be insufficient or that a need arises for expenditure which they could not foresee at the time of the budget; whereas with regard to further demands, Mr. President, there is no rule whatever, under what circumstances a further grant can be brought forward, whether it should be some new service not contemplated in the budget or whether it is for an excess amount which they did not anticipate. Those conditions are not to be applied according to our Rules and Standing Orders. Further grants are a class by themselves which can be brought, without any restrictions whatever. Therefore the right to bring forward further demands must be put on a higher footing under the present Rules and Standing Orders than supplementary or excess grants which can be brought forward only under specific circumstances. In the House of Commons with regard to additional estimates which are the only analogies to these further demands in our province, any additional estimate for a new matter not included in the original estimate of the year shall be submitted for consideration in the Committee of Supply on some day not later than two days before the committee is closed. Therefore there at least they must satisfy the Speaker or the Chairman of the Committee of Supply that it is some new matter not included in the original estimates for the year. The question arises as to what is the exact meaning of the phrase 'new matter,' whether it should be confined to a matter already provided for or it should be some new matter altogether. But to-day under our rules and Standing Orders, the Government can introduce further demands without any restrictions whatever. I submit therefore that to allow them to introduce further demands without any conditions would be a serious inroad on the rights of the Council.

" You were pleased to ask me about the new Standing Order 66-A which is really the most troublesome from my point of view. Before I deal with it, I shall invite your attention to the right of this House to make Standing Orders which is defined in section 72-D, clause (6). 'Standing Orders may be made providing for the conduct of business and the procedure to be followed in the Council in so far as these matters are not provided for by rules made under this Act.' My humble submission to you, Mr. President, is this. Standing Orders cannot confer on the executive the right to bring forward certain new class of budget grants. They can only provide for the conduct of business and the procedure to be followed in the Council."

\* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" It prescribes the procedure."

\* Mr. S. SATYAMURTI :—" Standing Order 66-A does not help us at all."



[28th March 1928]

\* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—"Nobody argues that the Standing Order gives power to move further demands."

\* Mr. S. SATYAMURTI :—"I need not then labour the point further. If I understand you aright, I think it is this. The Standing Order merely provides the procedure. You have come to the conclusion that the executive have got no right to move further demands under this Standing Order which merely prescribes the time-limit for the discussion of those demands and disposal of those demands. So far as that part of the argument is concerned, my task is made easier. But the second sentence of the Standing Order reads thus : 'The day so fixed by the Governor shall be some day before the last of the days allotted by him under rule 29 and the further demands shall be disposed of on that day.' If it is suggested that that means the guillotine is applied at 5 o'clock to-morrow, the 29th, and that all these demands shall be disposed of, that certainly is not within the competence of the Standing Order to confer upon the House."

\* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—"The question does not arise now ; we shall have to wait."

\* Mr. S. SATYAMURTI :—"I entirely agree. We need not anticipate these things. There is one other point which I want to submit. There are 38 further demands for grants on this paper. I do not want to anticipate anything. But in order to illustrate my point, may I invite your attention to the fact that some of these demands are further demands to demands not already voted on by this House? Demands XXVI, XXVII, XXVIII, XXIX up to XXXVI : none of these demands has yet come before this House. Very few of these will come before us except at guillotine time. These demands will merely be voted upon. I ask as a matter of English and as a matter of procedure, whether there can be further demands, to demands which have not come before the House and will never come before this House except at the time of the guillotine."

"Then, Sir, I want to point out also that there is no such provision for further demands in the Legislative Assembly. The only other authority that has got to be looked into is May's 'Parliamentary Practice' to which you referred. May's 'Parliamentary Practice' is based upon that Standing Order which provides that for any new matter not provided for in the original budget estimates there may be an additional estimate presented. What is that new matter we do not know. I have already submitted to you that in the House of Commons the system is entirely different. They come up with further demands in August, i.e., after April, May, June and July, four months after the new year has begun and there may be circumstances which may justify the new demand. In order to convince you that I am right in saying that these demands shall arise with regard to matters coming in after 31st March, may I invite your attention to the House of Commons Debates—Hansard, 5th series—132 at page 1047? Sir Laming Worthington Evans said 'I do not wish to discuss the point of order. But I wish to assure the committee that there has been no negligence on the part of the Government in putting this vote down at the earliest possible moment. The necessity for the vote did not arise until after the Coal Deliveries Agreement which was concluded at Spa on 16th July was made and that agreement necessitated the further detailed agreement which was made at Bolougne on the 26th July and after that it was necessary to communicate with the Reparations Commission and last Friday this vote was issued and I think the committee will

28th March 1928]

[Mr. S. Satyamurti]

see that, no matter for the moment what the value is of the point of order, in point of fact the Government has made no delay and has taken every measure to bring this before the Committee at the earliest possible moment.' Can it be contended here that these demands have arisen after the framing of the budget and that they have been brought forward at the earliest possible moment before this House?"

The hon. Mr. T. E. MOIR:—"May I indicate that these demands were necessitated after the framing of the budget and that we have taken the earliest possible opportunity afforded of bringing them before this House?"

\* Mr. S. SATYAMURTI:—"My point is this: The Government did not think of making experiments in the Anamalais forests all on a sudden after the framing of the budget. If there had been fire, or torrential rain or earthquake and if they wanted to conduct these experiments in order to prevent earthquakes, fires, etc., I can understand these experiments. These experiments are, I take it, in pursuance of this Government's policy which has been pursued for some time. It seems to me that this is not a new matter as is contemplated in this reference, where the agreement was concluded by the Government on the 16th July long after, the budget was presented to the House of Commons. It cannot be that because the Government make up their minds on 'a new matter in a different way' it becomes a new matter. Then, Sir, 5 per cent. of the Sub-Registrars' cadre are to be given a selection grade of Rs. 200 to Rs. 250; then for minor irrigation works damaged by the cyclone. When did the cyclone happen? Was it after the presentation of the budget? It happened last year. I am only giving instances to show that none of them comes under Parliamentary provisions to be treated as new matter.

12-15  
p.m.

"Then, Sir, the last point I wish to point out to this House is this. May is allright; the House of Commons is allright; they have got their own peculiar rules and privileges. Standing Order 79 gives you the right undoubtedly to apply Parliamentary analogies, but it is a restricted right to apply the House of Commons practice."

\* The hon. the PRESIDENT:—"That is only regarding the procedure."

\* Mr. S. SATYAMURTI:—"That Standing Order says that the President shall have power to regulate the conduct of business in the Council in all matters not provided for in the Act, the rules or the Standing Orders. My two submissions are, this is not conduct of business. When once it comes before the House, if you have no Standing Order, you can apply the House of Commons Standing Order. Secondly, these matters are provided for in the Act and rules, as to how these demands ought to be dealt with. Therefore I submit the only question is whether these demands do really come within the scope of the Government of India Act and the rules. It has been suggested, and the hon. the Finance Member has already anticipated, that the Government have come to us at the earliest possible moment. That is not correct, I say regretfully, because they cannot come to us before the end of the year merely because they feel that the budget provision is not sufficient. Then they must blame the departments. Otherwise it means this,—that the spending departments are not bound to send up accurate estimates to the treasury, that is, here the Finance Member. If these further demands are granted, it means that the treasury will not have control over the spending departments, if they do not send their estimates before October or

[Mr. S. Satyamurti]

[28th March 1928]

November. They must be told 'you must make up your minds to send the estimates before the end of October or November, or we won't include such estimates if you don't do it by that time.' Unless something in the new year happens, the Executive Government ought not to be compelled to destroy the unity and the accuracy of the budget estimates as a whole. Otherwise, what are these estimates worth? Therefore I submit, Mr. President, that the House of Commons practice does not govern us in terms; secondly, that these 'additional estimates' are based upon new matters that may arise because of the inordinate delay in passing the estimates; and thirdly because our rules and Standing Orders do not provide for further demands, but provide only for budget estimates, excess grants and supplementary grants. I therefore submit that these are out of order."

\* The hon. the PRESIDENT:—"This is not the first time that the hon. Member for the University has raised this point of order. I think he raised it in 1924 and my predecessor then held that further demands were in order. The same point was raised last year and I came to the conclusion tentatively that further demands were in order. I however promised that I would examine the question further. I have accordingly carefully examined the question and I have come to the conclusion that these further demands cannot be disallowed. Ever since the introduction of the Reforms, this Government have been in the habit of coming forward with further demands for the ensuing year, and a practice which has been in existence for more than seven years cannot be upset unless there is a statutory prohibition against it. My reading of section 72-D is that the presentation of the budget is different from the demands for grants. There is no justification for arguing that the Government of India Act or the rules enjoin that all the demands for a year shall be included in the budget presented to the House. In that case, even the excess grants and the supplementary grants would become a nullity. Therefore a liberal interpretation has to be placed on section 72-D. That section says: 'The estimated annual expenditure and revenue of the province shall be laid in the form of a statement before the Council in each year.' That is one thing. It then says: 'The proposals of the Local Government for the appropriation of Provincial revenues and other moneys in any year shall be submitted to the vote of the Council in the form of demands for grants.' This admittedly includes excess grants as well as supplementary grants. Excess grants and supplementary grants are not included in the budget presented to the House, and the question that next arises is whether the Council rules have exhausted the variety of grants that can be asked for or are only illustrative. I have come to the conclusion that they are merely illustrative and that further grants are not excluded by the rules. As to the procedure to be adopted, whatever doubts might have existed last year, they have since been cleared up by the new Standing Order 66-A which makes provision for the procedure to be adopted in regard to further grants. It has been said that additional estimates in England provide only for 'new matter,' but as far as my examination of the further grants of this year or of previous years in this province are concerned, they are really new matters. What takes place generally is this. The Government present their budget with such of the new items that have been approved by the Finance Committee and the Government before its preparation. Subsequent to the presentation of the budget, the Finance Committee meets and examines further urgent proposals and on being consented to by the Finance Committee, they are, if approved by the Government, put forward



28th March 1928]

[The President]

before the Council in the form of further demands. I do not see sufficient reason to say that they do not refer to new matters. If the hon. Member feels that express restrictions should be imposed on the power of this House to entertain further grants, it is open to the House by means of standing Orders to define the circumstances under which further demands should be brought up before the House.

“Regarding the question of the allotment of days, I don’t think it is in the interests of the House to come to the conclusion that the guillotine applies to further demands, supplementary demands or excess demands. Until the question actually arises, I don’t propose to examine it and of course it is not necessary at this stage to decide on it. I therefore hold that these further demands are in order.”

\* The hon. Mr. A. Y. G. CAMPBELL:—“Mr. President, Sir, the object of this demand is to enable the Government to carry on certain experiments in the manufacture of tea-boxes. There are in this Presidency about  $4\frac{1}{4}$  lakhs of acres of evergreen forests and those forests are generally in inaccessible parts of the Presidency and it is impossible to work them economically on any system except one of concentrated fellings. These forests contain various kinds of trees and although one kind of tree may be valuable, it may not be possible to find any use for the other kinds of trees in the same locality. It is therefore necessary to find some use for these other trees. The Forest department have for some time past been devoting their attention to endeavouring to find markets for these other kinds of evergreen trees. It has been suggested that the best way of utilizing them is to convert the timber into veneer for manufacture into tea-boxes. The cost of wooden tea-chests imported into Madras in 1925-26 amounted to 12 lakhs of rupees. Probably it was more in the following year. If, therefore, we can make tea-chests out of these evergreen forests, it will bring very much profit to Government and to this country. There are however various difficulties to be overcome. We have to ascertain whether the available trees are suitable for use in particular localities where operations have to be undertaken, whether a correct and uniform weight of tea-box can be produced, whether some of the woods believed to be suitable will not taint the tea, whether there will be a sufficient proportion of light-coloured woods to provide for the outer layers of the ply, and whether it will be possible to stimulate demand for locally-made articles. To enable Government to determine these various questions, it is desired to carry out this experiment. In the Anamalais there are some 23,000 acres of evergreen forests which are at present being cleared for growing cinchona. Now the Forest department extract sleepers from mesua in this area but other species of trees are felled and burnt; it is therefore proposed that an experiment should be made in this area of the Anamalais. The experiment is to be continued for a period of two years. The items of expenditure include Rs. 81,000 for machinery and Rs. 21,000 for buildings and the whole of that has to be expended in the first year. The running expenses include the staff, on which it is proposed to expend during the year 1928-29 a sum of Rs. 7,400; wages for coolies Rs. 2,000; and apparatus and other materials and other working expenses Rs. 14,900.

“A somewhat similar amount would be required for running expenses in the second year. The total cost of these experiments is therefore expected to come to about Rs. 1,51,660, of which a demand is now made for Rs. 1,26,300 for the year 1928-29.”

12-30  
p.m.

[28th March 1928]

Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR :—" Will the experiment be over in two years? "

\* The hon. Mr. A. Y. G. CAMPBELL :—" That is the present proposal. It is hoped that by the end of that time we can come to some definite conclusion whether we should pursue it further or not. The details of the plan have been worked out with reference to information obtained from Margherita in Assam where similar work is now being carried on. There will be some income from the experiment, as we hope to make some 5,000 tea-chests in six months in 1928-29 and if we sell them at Rs. 3-8-0 per box, they will fetch an income of Rs. 17,500. Excluding interest and overhead charges, the total expenditure is expected to go up to Rs. 25,955. Thus, there would be a loss of Rs. 8,455 in the year 1928-29, but naturally an experiment would usually involve a loss. That is but to be expected.

" My hon. Friend, the Member for the University, raised the question whether this could not have been included in the budget and why it was brought forward by the department after the due time for inclusion in the budget estimate. The proposal was sent over to the Finance Department on the 29th October."

Mr. S. SATYAMURTI :—" Last year? "

\* The hon. Mr. A. Y. G. CAMPBELL :—" Yes, last year. It was placed before the Finance Committee in the usual way amongst the schemes to be included in the budget. The Finance Committee at their meeting on the 7th January said that they could not, on the information before them, approve of the scheme and they made enquiries as to whether a less costly scheme could not be devised. The Chief Conservator and the Chief Forest Engineer proceeded to Margherita to make further enquiries and to some extent revised the estimate and this revised estimate was accepted by the Finance Committee. I have not got the exact date of the Finance Committee's meeting. I think it was the 14th March. It is desirable that this experiment should be carried out during the coming year, as the area in which it is to be carried out is being cleared in any case for other purposes. I move, therefore, that this grant be made."

\* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" The question is that Government be granted a sum not exceeding Rs. 1,26,300 under Demand IV—Forest."

\* Mr. K. V. R. SWAMI :—" Sir, I move this token motion to reduce the allotment of Rs. 1,26,300 by Rs. 100 (i) to ask for information whether any such experiments were carried before and what the result of such experiments was; (ii) to discuss the question of the necessity for the expenditure and (iii) to find out wherefrom the boxes are received into this Presidency and whether there is any chance of preventing such import by any tariff.

" Mr. President, Sir, my objection to this grant is that this Forest department has not been placed as yet on a commercial basis at all. Only about cinchona the Government are anxious to place it on a commercial basis. My reason for this opposition is this: from this year's budget, it is clear that about Rs. 49,64,000 is to be spent out of a revenue of Rs. 51,92,000 and the probable difference between the revenue and the expenditure would be about Rs. 2,00,000. Now the hon. the Law Member asks for Rs. 1,26,300 only to carry on an experiment, of which it would appear

28th March 1928]

[Mr. K. V. R. Swami]

Rs. 86,000 is required for machinery alone. This is the experiment that the Law Member proposes to carry out. But, he makes large promises that it may end in a gain of Rs 12,00,000 per year. Whoever knows it! That is the way in which the Law Member himself puts it, and he wants to restrict this experiment to two years."

The hon. Mr. A. Y. G. CAMPBELL :—"I did not say that the gain would be Rs. 12,00,000, but I said that boxes imported into this Presidency every year are worth Rs. 12,00,000."

\* Mr. K. V. R. SWAMI :—"I was thinking, Sir, that there would be an annual gain of Rs. 12,00,000 but my hon. Friend, the Law Member, corrects me by saying that he did not say that the gain would be twelve lakhs but that boxes worth twelve lakhs were being imported into this Presidency. And so there is the prospect that if they carry on this experiment, there will be the chance of our manufacturing tea-boxes which may compete with the boxes imported into this Presidency, and that probably successfully. They do not want to raise any tariff and they will not make any statement with regard to that. With regard to the experiment, whether Government are following any wise policy or not is the one thing we have to consider, because now they want to order machinery at a cost of Rs 86,000. That means so much money would go. Would it not therefore be worth while, one might ask, to perform this experiment and try to gain so much? We do not know how much would be gained. There is no estimate at all as to what would be the probable gain if we really succeeded in this experiment. No businessman will start his undertaking without having the prospectus before him. First he would see as to what would be the expenditure and what would be the gain and all that. But the hon. the Law Member gave us an estimate that it would fetch about Rs. 17,000, in six months and there would be so much under expenditure and so on. He has also given certain figures but unfortunately the thing is that in the explanatory note, no figures are furnished in respect of all these details. Only a bald statement is made there. Now on the floor of this House some further details are given.

"Now, Sir, there are two things we have to see. First, whether there is any wood available in the Anamalai forest that would suit this purpose. That is one thing and secondly, would it give any commercial gain to start this business. If there is no such wood available there in sufficient quantities, we need not perform any experiments at all with regard to this matter, and we need not incur all this expenditure of about one lakh on any machinery. It may not cost very much to find out whether there is wood that will be useful for this purpose. The one question the hon. the Law Member raised was whether the wood would suit the purpose for which it is intended, that is, whether it would not spoil the tea that is to be packed up in the chests produced by us.

"Another question is whether it would have uniform weight. To find out these two things no experiment with machinery at such cost is necessary at all. As to the availability of this wood in that forest, it can be found out through the Forest department and the other experiment can be carried on anywhere on a very small scale to find out whether that wood will suit the purpose and whether that wood will maintain uniform weight. Large promises were made with regard to forest administration even previously.



[Mr. K. V. R. Swami]

[28th March 1928]

And then, Sir, we have been contending that this department is recklessly managed and no profit gained at all. They are getting about Rs. 50,00,000 from the people and wasting the whole of it, every pie of it, almost. I have very little faith in these promises of getting any gain at all. Let us see, Sir, what Sir Lionel Davidson was saying in 1921-22. Sir Davidson said 'In the case of the Forest department, the State has already at its disposal immense and valuable assets capable of development to an extent which is impossible to describe in simple language.' That was the promise made to this House in 1921. All these years we have been waiting to see what commercial prospects there are and what assets they are going to produce, but we find after six years that there is nothing to be got from these forests. Now they want to try an experiment, a very costly experiment. Perhaps it may be found next year that the experiment should be tried further and so much more machinery will be required. Already the hon. the Law Member gave us a hint that the original estimate was much more than Rs. 1,26,300. Perhaps it was two or three or four lakhs or perhaps more. He has not taken us into his confidence as to what the original estimate was. Anyhow, the present estimate is costly enough.

"My submission, therefore, to this House, Mr. President, is that this experiment can be carried on at very much less cost. First they have to ascertain whether there is wood there; and if there is wood, whether that wood is suitable for making these boxes; and whether these boxes, if made, would be of uniform weight all through. These are the three things we have to consider. Then there will be the commercial portion of it. If machinery is applied and if experts are engaged for making these boxes, we must find out whether it would end in profit or loss. For that we need not purchase the whole machinery worth Rs. 86,000 now. They have tried such experiments before and we know what happened with regard to the Saw Mills and the Jam Factory and all the rest of them. So, this costly experiment need not be voted by us at all and we may first of all find out or get information whether this can have a commercial prospect and if there is any chance of making money. We are already losing a great deal in this department. I am told that some American expert was engaged formerly to perform experiments like this and that he actually went to America with certain samples to find out whether these things could be sold in America. Such experts have not done, up to now, any good and this experiment will only entail further cost on the department which will ultimately end in loss."

\* Mr C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR :—"While sympathizing with the object of the motion, Sir, I would ask the Government whether they cannot postpone the consideration of this question, and bring forward this matter later on, if it is necessary, as a supplementary grant. The question of this experiment is no doubt one worth consideration. If really there is timber which is becoming rotten and if that timber can be converted into tea-chests, it will be a desirable thing indeed. About a few years ago, some tea-chests were actually made out of some forest timber, and we in the Forest Advisory Committee were shown some timbers which could be manufactured into chests. I believe there are cases where these tea-chests have been made out of some Indian forest timber. One important question is as to the probable cost even as is estimated at present. To carry on the experiment we were told Rs. 1½ lakhs would be necessary. But the question is, Sir,

28th March 1928] [Mr. C. V. Venkataramana Ayyangar]

whether this machinery will be of any use after these two years and after the experiments are over. From what Mr. K. V. R. Swami has said, it seems to me doubtful whether any portion of this machinery will be useful at all after the experiment is over. I believe, Sir, that it must be of some use; supposing the experiment fails in this particular forest, it may be carried on elsewhere in some other forest. But my difficulty is in how many places this experiment is to be tried year after year. Supposing these experiments fail in the Anamalais forest, do they propose to make similar experiments in the neighbouring forests where there may be also timber which may be at present useless? Anyhow, the cost, so far as machinery is concerned, seems to be very high. Is there not any machinery anywhere in India that can test the colouring of this timber and wood? If there is any such machinery anywhere, they can remove some portions of the particular tree or trees and find out whether they are likely to colour the tea that will be placed in these chests.

"A few days ago, Sir, when I dealt with this question of American machinery being brought and European machinery being brought, there was some doubt expressed regarding the correctness of my statement. I want to know who purchased the machinery and when, who gave the order; has any order been given at all in anticipation of the sanction of this House, and if so, for what amount? I want to know now whether this machinery which is to cost nearly one lakh will be useful in other forests. I think we will be placing ourselves in an awkward position if we pass the demand without careful scrutiny. The object is of course very good; if on importing tea-chests we have to spend Rs. 12 lakhs, it is certainly worth while to look into the matter as, though it may be Rs. 12 lakhs to-day, if the tea plantations go on increasing, it may be that they will require more and more chests, with the result that we will have to import large quantities of them from outside. Reference was made, Sir, to the import duties. I don't think the Government can levy heavy import duties unless they are able to see that these chests are available in India and they can be made here as a business concern. All that we say is that this experiment may be made still cheaper. Why should permanent buildings be erected just now? Temporary sheds may perhaps be sufficient. Why should costly machinery be purchased now to be installed on the hills; it may also take some money to get it up the hills. These are matters which the Government ought to consider. I am in full sympathy with the object of the motion, but when the cost is considered, any one will hesitate. Merely for the purpose of experimenting on a doubtful matter, to spend Rs. 2 lakhs is rather unfair. I therefore request Government to go into the matter, see if the machinery for this experiment cannot be got in this country, whether cheaper machinery cannot be got, whether permanent buildings costing a good deal of money should be erected and whether temporary buildings will not be sufficient, and also whether any buildings already in existence cannot be utilized temporarily for this purpose. I do not know if a new establishment also is necessary. I believe, Sir, and I think Government are also aware of the fact, that there are some hands unnecessarily working in the department; some of these hands may be asked to work on this new experiment. We know that in other departments people are asked to take charge of other work temporarily in addition to their own. Can we not ask some of the people already working in the department to make this experiment? To sum up, Sir, we should be glad to know who is going to make the experiment, whether any specialist is going to be brought

12-45  
P.m.

[Mr. C. V. Venkataramana Ayyangar] [28th March 1928]

from America, what is the nature of the machinery, by whom it has been purchased, when and where, and whether that machinery will be of any use after the experiment is concluded, or whether it has to be scrapped out afterwards. These are things to be considered. After all, the Government have waited so long and it will not matter if they wait for another two or three months more and then bring this matter before the House."

\* Mr. C. GOPALA MENON :—"Sir, my position is this : that we must not take into account the failures that were met with in undertakings by the Government, like the Russellkonda Saw Mill or other commercial undertakings by Government with regard to the Forest department. I view this from a different standpoint. We know that there are many varieties of wood in the evergreen forests of Anamalais. We also know that these varieties of wood can be used for many purposes such as for making veneers for tea-chests, veneers and splints for match-boxes. Mr. Swami wanted to know whether such a costly machinery to the tune of over Rs. 1 lakh is required for this purpose. I may bring to the notice of this House that a match factory has been started in this province not only for making matches but also for making veneers and splints for matches, and nearly Rs. 7 lakhs of capital has been invested on it. I am only citing this as an example."

\* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—"I request the hon. Member to come to the pertinent portion very soon."

Mr. C. GOPALA MENON :—"What I say is that for the purpose of experimenting in the matter of these tea-chests, this Rs. 1 lakh need not be considered too much. Whether that experiment is going to be successful or not is however another matter. The hon. the Law Member pointed out that in the first year there is going to be a probable loss of Rs. 8,000. That is what I understood from his speech. Evidently it is natural, because all these experiments in the initial stage are beset with certain difficulties, and an experiment of this character is very likely to bring a loss in the first year of its undertaking but because of that it is not to be given up. If the experiment proves a success, it may lead on to other enterprises. We know that we have been importing wooden boxes from foreign countries of the value of Rs. 12 lakhs; and that difficulty could be got over if the wood in the forest could be utilized for the purpose of making these tea-chests. Later on, this experiment may also lead to other activities in the Forest department such as making veneers for match-boxes, etc. I therefore think that an experiment of this character is in the interests of the trade and is likely to lead to further activities of the Forest department in other directions. I accordingly support the motion for total grant."

\* The hon. Mr. A. Y. G. CAMPBELL :—"Mr. President, Sir, my hon. Friend Mr. Swami asked for certain information regarding this experiment. There has been no experiment on a scale of this size in this Presidency before. Manufacture of ply-wood from Indian timbers is being carried on successfully at present by the Assam Timber and Trading Company at Marghirita in Assam. That is the manufactory to which I referred to in my opening speech. The Chief Conservator and the Chief Forest Officer visited this factory. Along with the Assam Saw Mills and Timber Company, Limited, the Assam Railways and Trading Company, Limited, and the Julpadgari Timber and Lead Mills Company are also engaged in India in the manufacture of ply-wood. The ply-wood industry has been in existence in



28th March 1928]

[Mr. A. Y. G. Campbell]

the Dutch Indies since 1918 and by 1925 there were five ply-wood plants in operation in Java and Sumatra, the timber used being of the tropical species, very similar to Madras species.

"The hon. Member also wanted information as to the countries from which tea-boxes are imported into this Presidency, and as to whether there is any chance of preventing such import by any tariff. In his report on the utilization of the forest resources of this Presidency, Mr. Pearce stated that most of the wooden tea-chests imported were coming from the United Kingdom and that it was believed that many were manufactured in Scandinavia and were transhipped at British ports. German, Russian and Japanese tea-chests were also stated to be just beginning to appear on the market in India.

"The hon. Member also raised the question of tariff. The Tariff Board has considered this question and issued its report last month. The Government of India have recently accepted the recommendation of the Tariff Board that the manufacture of ply-wood tea-chests should be protected for a period of five years. In pursuance of this policy, they have decided to introduce legislation imposing a duty of 30 per cent on all forms of ply-wood and the battens and corner pieces of ply-wood chests and to abolish the drawback at present admissible under the Sea Customs Act, 1870, on re-export. The Government of India are therefore already taking measures in the direction suggested by the hon. Member.

'Turning now to the criticism of my hon. Friend Mr. Venkataramana Ayyangar, he seems to have considerable doubt whether all this machinery can be used after the experiment has been completed. I may tell him that the whole cost of the machinery for two years will be Rs. 81,000 and of that amount, Rs. 22,000 is for the purchase of one 40—60 horse-power engine with boilers, Rs. 11,000 for a 42-inch veneer lathe, etc., and Rs. 9,000 for a veneer redrier. There are various smaller items such as hand press with plates and clamps, veneer knife grinder, clipper, etc., and these will of course be useful if the Government decide to undertake work on a large scale. The cost on a commercial scale has been estimated at between 2½ and 6½ lakhs, and the Chief Conservator puts it at about 5½ lakhs as a reasonable figure. The amount to be spent on buildings now is only Rs. 20,000 and we are not going to have any expensive buildings. The staff includes one foreman-superintendent, who has been trained in ply-wood manufacture, and I do not think that there is anybody in this Presidency qualified in ply-wood manufacture who would be prepared to undertake this job for anything less than Rs. 1,000."

MR. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR :—"Wherefrom does he come?"

\* The hon. Mr. A. Y. G. CAMPBELL :—"He has not been engaged yet, but the amount stated here is only an estimate of the amount that we will have to pay every month."

(At this stage some questions were put to the hon. the Law Member by Members of the Opposition in a low tone.)

\* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—"I cannot permit any dialogue between the Members of the Opposition and a Member on the Treasury Bench when he is addressing the Chair."

Diwan Bahadur P. KESAVA PILLAI :—"They are doing it across the table, Sir."

[28th March 1928]

\* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" They may do it with the other Members of the Government."

\* The hon. Mr. A. Y. G. CAMPBELL :—" There is a lathe operator on Rs. 40 a month and two more operators on the same pay, with others on less pay."

" As regards the suggestion that it might be possible to make an experiment by sending wood to other places for treatment, that point was considered and the Chief Conservator has reported, after consulting the firm in Assam, that reliable data could not be obtained by carrying out an experiment on those lines. Very large quantities of timber would have to be sent for treatment to Assam and they would reach Assam a long time afterwards, but evergreen wood deteriorates rapidly after it has been cut down. The climate of Northern Assam is very different from that of the Madras West Coast and the problems of drying and glueing differ widely. It would be imprudent to base any conclusions on the results of experiments carried on in Assam with Madras timbers."

1 p.m. \* Mr. S. SATYAMURTI :—" Mr. President, Sir, though the hon. Members for Godavari and Coimbatore supported this cut on their grounds, I should like this House to support this cut motion on other grounds also. This supplementary demand is an extreme example, if I may say so, of the length to which the Executive Government will go in putting forward further demands under the Standing Orders as they are at present. For, we have been told quite frankly that in October last the Forest department had put forward proposals for this experiment, and on the 7th January the Finance Committee turned it down on the ground that the experiment was impossible. Then the department put a modest estimate. The Finance Committee wanted further information and on the 17th March the Finance Committee ultimately recommended the scheme for being placed before this House. It seems to me this is not a case coming exactly under the term 'supplementary grant' to be placed before this House to provide for services which arose during the course of the year and which was not contemplated at the time of the budget. This service was contemplated, but was not provided in the budget for reasons best known to the Treasury Bench and the Finance Committee. I want to say that the Treasury Bench owes a duty to this House in placing before this House a supplementary grant. This House cannot accede to it unless they show that in the exercise of their duties with all the diligence expected of them they could not have foreseen this demand, because it was beyond their control, it was unanticipated, and therefore they were not able to make a provision for it in the budget for the year."

" What are the facts of the present case? The facts are that the experiments are intended to find suitable markets for some of our forest products by means of investing Rs. 5 lakhs on tea-chests. This is a comparatively old trade and this could have been put forward even at the time of the presentation of the budget. It passes my comprehension how this can be put forward as a new matter, that came upon them unanticipated and therefore capable of being raised as a further demand."

" Secondly, our Forest department is a concern which is being run on a very low profit. According to the figures of the budget, we have the figure of 51.92 on the Revenue side and 45.61 on the Expenditure side, so

28th March 1928]

[Mr. S. Satyamurti]

that about 6 lakhs of rupees is the profit which we hope to make out of the Forest department during the next year. That budget is presented to the House, and the House votes on it hoping that they will realize a profit of 6 lakhs of rupees. But what do we find? Fifteen days after this, a further demand is made to set apart 1½ lakhs for experiments in the Forest department. Roughly, one-fourth of the profit that is expected is sought to be set apart for expenditure. Is it fair to present a budget with a paper profit of 6 lakhs of rupees in the Forest department and then after fifteen days to bring forward a supplementary grant for an experiment costing a fourth of that? What is then the value of the budget discussion? Therefore it seems to me, while your ruling stands as it must, it does not cast any obligation on this House to encourage such demands. Mr. President, it is your province to interpret the Standing Orders. What I now wish to point out is that this bringing forward of a further demand of this excessive kind takes away one-fourth of the anticipated profits to be utilized in a service which they must have known to exist before they presented the budget, but which perhaps due to laxity in administrative efficiency they were not able to foresee. It is open to this House to tell the hon. the Finance Member that he must tell the departments concerned that they must give a correct account of what they want next year before they make up the budget for the next year.

“Does this system exist anywhere in the world, in any commercial concern? We have here Sir James Simpson representing a great commercial concern. Supposing his assistant calculates the profits for the next year at Rs. 6 lakhs and within a fortnight says he has made a mistake and the profits must be reduced by a fourth, will he not dismiss his assistant? After having sent in the report for the next year to his directors in Britain suppose it is said that the assistant forgot to make a provision for an item, what will be his reply? He will say ‘Sorry, nothing can be done now, the report has already been sent’. Are the Government of Madras not going to observe the ordinary rules of business? Are they going to encourage laxity?”

“Lastly, this experiment is not to be carried on only next year, but in the course of the next year and also the year after the next. (Laughter.) Is it suggested by the hon. the Law Member ignoring all canons of business, propriety and fairness that this experiment should be proceeded with from the 1st of April 1928? Why can't they wait for some time? I can understand if it is a matter of urgency. Apart from the arguments advanced by the hon. Members for Godavari and Coimbatore, I want this House to tell the hon. the Law Member that this House will not and cannot allow itself to be trifled with by introducing anomalous further demands in the last two days of its session and thereby upset the whole budget of the year and make the House feel that the budget is but a volume of unreliable figures.” (Hear, hear.)

Mr. P. ANJANEYULU :—“I wish to know before I say anything relevant whether I shall be in order if at this stage I move for an adjournment.”

\* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—“You may move.”

Mr. P. ANJANEYULU :—“We are told that between January and March this department had to revise its demands and came to a more modest figure.”



[28th March 1928]

The hon. Mr. A. Y. G. CAMPBELL :—" We want to increase the figure . . . "

Mr. P. ANJANEYULU :—" I am glad to be corrected. We are told that within six months the experiment will be started."

\* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" The hon. Member is going into the merits."

Mr. P. ANJANEYULU :—" I am only supporting the adjournment motion with reasons and I hope I will be permitted to say a few words. Now we are going to set the example of Assam and I dare say local men with the intelligence and aptitude for a service like this will not be wanting in this country, so that they may be engaged on smaller pay. They may be sent to Assam to learn the work. As far as the scheme is concerned, it may be a gain to the Government. It is not one of those cases like cinchona where urgent measures have to be taken to . . . "

\* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" I am afraid the hon. Member is going into the merits of the case."

Mr. P. ANJANEYULU :—" I am only saying that this is not a very urgent case and I therefore move that this be adjourned."

\* Mr. J. A. SALDANHA :—" I second it. The hon. the Law Member read his speech from a note of some three printed pages, which we could not follow properly. The note supplied to us contains only a few lines. As regards the establishment concerned, we are told that Government will incur the expenditure after six months. Therefore there is no hurry about it. We can wait till the officer sent to Assam to be trained returns and takes charge of the department. As regards the machinery I don't think Government have sent in orders already. Therefore we can wait for some time. I think it will be better if samples of the wood to be used are placed here so that hon. Members of this House may have an idea of the sort of wood, as is done in the demonstration classes." (Laughter.)

\* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" I am afraid the hon. Member is not in order in saying these things in supporting the motion for adjournment."

1-15  
p.m.

\* Mr. J. A. SALDANHA :—" What I urge is that we want more details."

\* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" I have already said that the hon. Member is dealing with the merits of the grant and therefore he is not in order."

\* Mr. J. A. SALDANHA :—" Sir, we want to get more details about this new venture of a peculiar sort. More information is necessary before we can decide this important subject . . . "

\* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" I have already ruled that the hon. Member is not entitled to go into the merits of the question. He is entitled to second the motion for adjournment of the consideration of the question and make remarks pertinent thereto."

\* Mr. J. A. SALDANHA :—" What are the reasons for . . . "

\* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" If the hon. Member persists in his disregard for the rule of relevancy to the motion under discussion, I shall be put to the painful necessity of bringing to his notice rules 16 and 17 of the

28th March 1928]

[The hon. the President]

Madras Legislative Council Rules. Before I make use of those rules, I may, for the benefit of the hon. Member, read out those rules. Rule 16 runs thus :—

“The President, after having called the attention of the Council to the conduct of a member who persists in irrelevance or in tedious repetition either of his own arguments or of the arguments used by other members in debate, may direct him to discontinue his speech.”

\* Mr. J. A. SALDANHA :—“Where are the merits of the case? I am only making out a case . . . .”

\* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—“The hon. Member is requested to resume his seat.”

\* The hon. Mr. A. Y. G. CAMPBELL :—“Mr. President, I am unable to accept this motion for the adjournment of the consideration of this question. I have endeavoured to place before the House all the facts that are at our disposal and I do not think that I shall be able to place before it any more facts even if the discussion is adjourned. I oppose the motion.”

The question that the consideration of this motion be postponed till the next meeting of the Council was put to the House and declared lost.

A poll was demanded and the House divided thus :—

*Ayes.*

- |                                    |                                                |
|------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------|
| 1. Mr. S. Satyamurti.              | 16. Mr. C. Ramasomayajulu.                     |
| 2. " C. V. Venkataramaya Ayyangar. | 17. " Basheer Ahmad Sayeed Sahib.              |
| 3. " T. Adinarayana Chettiyar.     | 18. " P. Bhaktavatsula Nayudu.                 |
| 4. " P. Anjaneyulu.                | 19. " A. Kaleswara Rao.                        |
| 5. " J. A. Saldanha.               | 20. " R. Srinivasa Ayyangar.                   |
| 6. " C. S. Govindaraja Mudaliyar.  | 21. " K. Koti Reddi.                           |
| 7. " G. Harisarvottama Rao.        | 22. " K. V. Krishnaswami Nayakar.              |
| 8. " C. N. Muthuranga Mudaliyar.   | 23. " A. Ranganatha Mudaliyar.                 |
| 9. " Abdul Hamid Khan Sahib.       | 24. Diwan Bahadur R. N. Arogyaswami Mudaliyar. |
| 10. " K. V. R. Swami.              | 25. Mr. R. Nagan Gowda                         |
| 11. " Muhammad Meera Ravuttar.     | 26. " C. R. Parthasarathi Ayyangar.            |
| 12. " D. Narayana Raju.            | 27. " B. Ramachandra Reddi.                    |
| 13. Dr. B. S. Mallaya.             | 28. The Kumara Raja of Venkatagiri.            |
| 14. Mr. K. R. Karant.              |                                                |
| 15. " M. Narayana Rao.             |                                                |

*Noes.*

- |                                                 |                                      |
|-------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| 1. The hon. Sir Norman Macjoribanks.            | 19. Mr. Muppil Nayar of Kavalappara. |
| 2. " Khan Bahadur Muhammad Usman Sahib Bahadur. | 20. Subadar-Major Nanjappa Bahadur.  |
| 3. " Mr. T. E. Moir.                            | 21. Mr. T. M. Narayanaswami Pillai.  |
| 4. " Mr. A. Y. G. Campbell.                     | 22. " N. Siva Raj.                   |
| 5. " Mr. M. R. Seturatnam Ayyar.                | 23. " M. V. Gangadhara Siva          |
| 6. " Mr. S. Muthiah Mudaliyar.                  | 24. Rao Sahib L. C. Guruswami.       |
| 7. " Dr. P. Subbarayan.                         | 25. Mr. V. I. Muniswami Pillai.      |
| 8. Mr. H. A. Watson.                            | 26. " W. P. A. Soundarapandia Naçar. |
| 9. " G. T. Boag.                                | 27. " S. Venkayya.                   |
| 10. " A. McG. C. Tampoe.                        | 28. " M. A. Manikkavelu Nayakar.     |
| 11. " S. H. Slater.                             | 29. Syed Ibrahim Sahib Bahadur.      |
| 12. " C. B. Cotterell.                          | 30. Sir James Simpson.               |
| 13. " P. J. Gnanavaram Pillai.                  | 31. Mr. Kenneth Kay.                 |
| 14. " R. Foulkes.                               | 32. The Zamindar of Kallikota.       |
| 15. " C. D. Appavu Chettiyar.                   | 33. Mr. K. Ramachandra Padayachi.    |
| 16. " J. Bheemayya.                             | 34. " G. R. Premayya.                |
| 17. " V. Ch. John.                              | 35. Swami A. S. Sahajananda.         |
| 18. " Mahmud Schamnad Sahib.                    | 36. Rao Sahib R. Srinivasan          |
|                                                 | 37. Syed Tajudin Sahib Bahadur.      |

[28th March 1928]

## Noes—cont.

- |                                                 |                                              |
|-------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------|
| 38. Mr. V. Ramjee Rao.                          | 43. Diwan Bahadur P. C. Ethirajulu Nayudu.   |
| 39. Rao Bahadur C. S. Ratnasabhapati Mudaliyar. | 44. Khan Bahadur Abdul Razack Sahib Bahadur. |
| 40. The Raja of Panagal.                        | 45. Muhammad Khadir Mohideen Sahib Bahadur.  |
| 41. Rao Bahadur Sir A. P. Patro.                | 46. Rao Bahadur K. Sitarama Reddi.           |
| 42. Diwan Bahadur M. Krishnan Nayar.            |                                              |

Ayes 28.

Noes 46.

The motion was lost.

The question that the allotment of Rs. 1,26,300 for experiments in the Anamalais forests be reduced by Rs. 100 was put to the House and lost.

- \* Mr. J. A. SALDANHA :—“ Mr. President, I beg to move  
‘that the allotment of Rs. 1,26,300 for certain experiments in the  
Anamalais forests be reduced by Rs 100.’

“ My object is to discuss how far Indianisation of the service for this work is carried out, what the details of the staff and establishment are and how far they are European and how far Indian.

“ Though this is a small item, the question that I am raising is one of great importance. We have to remember that there is a bigger staff and establishment, the exploitation and utilization one of the Forest department. Under that head, the number of officers has increased from three to five. We have also got another deputy utilization officer. I find here. . . ”

The hon. Mr. A. Y. G. CAMPBELL :—“ May I ask if the hon. Member is in order in discussing the staff that is not included under this demand ? ”

\* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—“ The hon. Member will not be in order if he goes beyond the items included under this grant.”

\* Mr. J. A. SALDANHA :—“ This is not a supplemental demand, but an additional demand for this year.”

\* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—“ My ruling regarding further grants is also the same as regards supplementary grants.”

\* Mr. J. A. SALDANHA :—“ I bow to it, Sir. I want to know what this staff will consist of, whether it will consist of an European or American or Indian officer.”

The hon. Mr. A. Y. G. CAMPBELL :—“ It is not said there that he will be an European or Indian.”

\* Mr. J. A. SALDANHA :—“ We want an assurance that he will be an Indian. It seems to me, that what is under contemplation is, as in many other cases, to appoint an European or American. Formerly many of these officers were sent to places like the Philippines and trained. But not one of them was an Indian. We want an assurance from the Government that this officer will be an Indian. I hope that before long, under the regime of the new Law Member at least . . . ”

\* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—“ As it is, let us deal with the temporary Law Member.”

\* Mr. J. A. SALDANHA :—“ Let us hope for some Indianisation at least under this new venture.”

The hon. Mr. A. Y. G. CAMPBELL :—“ Mr. President, Sir, I have already explained that the superior staff consists of the only one officer to whom



28th March 1928]

[Mr. A. Y. G. Campbell]

Mr. Saldaha particularly refers, the Foreman-Superintendent. We may have to appoint a suitable officer from elsewhere if we cannot find anybody suitable for this work in this Presidency."

\* Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR :—" Sir I am surprised that the Government are not able to say even after taking six months over this question whether the officer to be appointed will be an European or an American or an Indian, and if an Indian, from what part of India. Our complaint is that the Forest department is considered to be more or less a preserve for the Europeans. Various reasons have been given to show that the forests do not suit the health of Indians, that they are affected by malaria and so on. Why not at least now take Indians? This work is a kind of mere carpentry work. Even at Olavakkot, tea-boxes were made. I want to know whether for this simple work Indians cannot be found in this country. We shall certainly press this case, Sir."

Diwan Bahadur P. KESAVA PILLAI :—" We do not at all hear the speech of the hon. Member. There is too much noise in the House."

\* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" This is not a point of order."

\* Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR :—" We should have a definite promise from the Government. I do not want the present Law Member who is a good and sympathetic gentleman to commit himself to any statement, for very shortly there will be another Law Member . . ."

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" I have already requested hon. Members to confine themselves to the temporary Law Member."

\* Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR :—" I only want an assurance from the present Member that Government would try their best to get an Indian officer to this place, and if possible, from the Madras Presidency itself. The Forest department in this Presidency is praised for its efficiency; there are ever so many Indian officers who are doing special duties and research work and it would really be a great misfortune, if not a scandal, if in this case also an Indian officer of the Madras service is not available. My fear is that attempts have been made to get an European or an American and we are justified in drawing this inference."

" I think the hon. the Law Member stated that the new officer is going to be appointed only six months hence. So the appointment will last for the latter half of the year. We are particular about having Indians in this matter because the moment the appointment is over, the experience, knowledge and service will be lost to the country if the appointment is to be held by a foreigner. Therefore the only reasonable reply that we can expect is that they would get the best man from the Presidency, and if such a man is not available here, to get one from any other province of India."

1-30  
p.m.

At this stage the House rose for lunch.

### After Lunch (2-30 p.m.)

\* The hon. Mr. A. Y. G. CAMPBELL :—" With reference to the remarks that fell from the hon. Member, Mr. C. V. Venkataramana Ayyangar, I would only like to say that we will very carefully consider the suggestion that some

[Mr. A. Y. G. Campbell]

[28th March 1928]

forest officer of the department should be deputed for training ; if that is not feasible, we will advertise in India for a suitable man, before attempting to obtain any one from outside India."

\* Mr. K. V. R. SWAMI :—" Sir, the hon. the Law Member has given an undertaking which may ultimately fructify. But from the way in which it was put, it may be quite hopeless. The assurance the House wants from him is that he will undertake to appoint an Indian if possible from this province. Of course the hon. Member said that this would have his best consideration. Is it merely a formal assurance? A Member in charge would consider all things and there is no question of that at all. We want an assurance that only an Indian would be employed. This department is said to be a close preserve for foreigners and if you look at the figures in other cases also it has always been like that. The man who draws a high salary will be an European and an Indian would not get it. So far as the House is concerned, we want an assurance that in this case only an Indian will be employed. After all what is the work to be done? Only he has to select the kind of wood for the making of tea-chests. No expert knowledge is required, especially European expert knowledge, because they are not accustomed to this particular kind of wood which is available in these forests. The species of wood available in these forests may not be available in other countries. Even for the Russellkonda Saw Mill there is a seasoning officer. If it is impossible to get hold of one in this country, and if the Government really want to have an Indian for this appointment, they may have an expert on condition that he should train an Indian in this business, one from the department itself. A new expert might be brought here on condition that he will have to train an Indian from the department within six months and then walk out. That is what Japan has been doing. If men are not available in Japan, they get their own men trained with the assistance of a foreign expert. But here the Government simply find out a job for an European. We do not mind whether it is an Englishman or an American ; because one is as good as the other because so much money will go out of this country. That is my grievance. Hon. Members have pressed here on the floor of this House in time and out of time that certain communities should be given special representation. When a point like this comes for vote, they simply vote with the Government. I desire that we show by our vote that we really want an Indian, whether he is a Muhammadan or Christian, Brahman or non-Brahman or depressed classes man. This is a question of having an European or Indian. If we can get hold of the job, anybody may get it. That is a different thing. So I request my hon. Friends, if there is any sincerity in their demand that particular classes should get it, to first see that the post is Indianized, and vote for this and show their sincerity by their vote."

\* Mr. G. HARISARVOTTAMA RAO :—" Sir, a thousand rupees a month to superintend the making of tea-chests. An Indian graduate, a double graduate, a practitioner at the bar, a man employed in the highest rungs of service, may gasp for breath at this figure. This Government has been so futile of resources that it has not been able to train a decent man in this country to take up a job of this kind. There has not been any attempt made. Admittedly there is a place in Assam where tea-chests are made. No attempt has been made to apprentice an Indian there. Yet we are told that all this is for the benefit of this country, for the betterment of our forests and for the commercialization of those forests.

28th March 1928] [Mr. G. Harisarovtama Rao]

I wonder, Sir, where the advantage lies for India in this scheme with an outside expert on thousand rupees a month. The only advantage that appears to me to be in any manner possible is the advantage to the expert who is likely to take the place and the next advantage may be to the people who want tea-chests made for their own purpose more cheaply in India at the expense of an experiment which the Government are obligingly prepared to make. Except that, there is really no policy in experiments of this nature. Government will do well even now to pause and see whether they should waste thousand rupees a month on an outside expert. They must lay down a policy of training experts wherever possible. This is a very simple business after all and any good carpenter in this country with some intelligence can do this work, provided he is given the training. I know of men, maistris in the Buckingham and Carnatic Mills, who have done gloriously with regard to the details of machinery in these particular mills. Their products were exhibited in exhibitions and there are plenty of men in this country—carpenters and smiths and others—who can develop certainly sufficient capacity to conduct such industries. Have the Government moved their little finger in the direction of improving the capacity of the Indian citizen for work of this nature? Even when work of this nature is contemplated are the Government seriously thinking whether it is not possible to send an apprentice to Assam, get him trained, bring him here and use him on this work? I see no proposal of that kind before us. I see merely a demand made of us that we shall pay down lakhs of money to be utilized by a superintendent whose pay shall be a thousand rupees per mensem, an amount which is not the average pay of the brightest jewel of the Madras University. That is the condition to which we are reduced. This appears to be a small matter on the face of it; but it is really a matter of great importance. It is a matter really for the Government to consider most carefully and a matter in which the prospects of the artisans of this country are involved. Our artisans are merely used as instruments for the foreigner to earn. Institutes that are started for artisans are merely manufactories of labourers. Beyond that, genius is not encouraged ordinarily. If the Government do not make up their mind to discover a man—I am told ‘to discover’ is a strong word—to find out a man—I say it is their duty to encourage Indian genius and help it on such lines. It is only then that it will be possible to conduct this experiment to a successful issue. The foreigner may be here for a time and his trade secrets may not be out within that length of time. His vested interests may stand in the way of the experiments becoming a success. A thousand rupees for an ordinary business of this nature is certainly a sum which will create vested interests. I hope Government will consider this aspect of the question and I hope this House will carry the motion brought forward by my hon. Friend.”

Mr. ABDUL HAMID KHAN:—“It is really deplorable that Government should continue to pursue this policy of exploiting Indian capital for the sake of finding a job for their countryman, however incapable or however ignorant he might be. It is this system of bringing one man after another that has been responsible for making Indians distrust the Government. Sir, it is really this particular matter that brings to light the fundamentals on which the system has been based and that is not for the advantage of the people of this country but for others. Sir, may I not ask the Government whether this does not expose the theory of trusteeship that has been advanced before us from time to time?”



[28th March 1928]

2-45 The hon. Mr. A. Y. G. CAMPBELL :—"Is the hon. Member in order in P.m. discussing trusteeship?"

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—"Trusteeship as regards Indianization is, I think, referred to."

Mr. ABDUL HAMID KHAN :—"I was saying that this is only a simple and single matter. The entire policy of the Government has been to appoint Europeans for such things as the preparation of tea-chest boxes. They have to seek the help of a foreigner when they launch upon a simple scheme like this of making tea-chests. Their policy in this country has been not for the purpose of increasing the industrial position of this country but for the purpose of wiping the tears of the Indian people and of shutting their mouths when they cry for Indianization here and for Indianization there and not for the purpose of opening industries and educating the people to take to industrial pursuits in this country. But there have been both in this province and elsewhere attempts, not sincere, to start an industry here and an industry there only just to show that they are making all efforts they can to improve the industries of the country. The industries they have been launching in this province have proved to be a failure. We may take any industrial concern. There is nothing to point out that any one scheme has been a success. This is the way in which the industrial condition of the country is improved. To-day when we want to start a small concern like this for the purpose of manufacturing tea-chests, we have to depend upon an Englishman, or an American, or a German or a Swedish man to come and supervise this simple industry. Can we compare ourselves with any country in the West or with any country even in the East in this matter, especially with our civilization, with our numerous resources, with our ability to do anything compared with anybody in the world? What are we to-day? We cannot find a single Indian to supervise such a small concern as making tea-chests in our country. We have to pay a salary of Rs. 1,000 per mensem for a gentleman who in his own country, I can assure the House, will not be able to earn Rs. 200 or 300. He may be an Inspector in a factory or he may be an ordinary supervisor in a small factory in his own home getting Rs. 100 or 200 a month. The Government here are ready to open their arms to receive him and pay him a salary of Rs. 1,000 a month. Is this not exploitation? Is this Indianization which they have professed from time to time? I say, Sir, the time has come when this sort of exploitation should stop. I am sure that hon. Members who have any self-respect and who I dare say want to find food for their countrymen in their own country will not be a party to this sort of exploitation and will certainly vote for this motion."

The hon. Sir NORMAN MARJORIBANKS :—"I move that the question be put."

The closure motion was put to the House and declared carried.

A poll was demanded and the House divided as follows :—

*Ayes.*

- |                                                |                                   |
|------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| 1. The hon. Sir Norman Marjoribanks.           | 5. The hon. Dr. P. Subbarayan.    |
| 2. " Khan Bahadur Muhammad Usman Sahib Bahadur | 6. " Mr. S. Muthiah Mudaliyar.    |
| 3. " Mr. T. E. Moir.                           | 7. " Mr. M. R. Sethuratnam Ayyar. |
| 4. " Mr. A. Y. G. Campbell.                    | 8. Mr. F. B. Evans.               |
|                                                | 9. " H. A. Watson.                |

28th March 1928]

*Ayes—cont.*

- |                                           |                                      |
|-------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| 10. Mr. G. T. Boag.                       | 27. Mr. S. Venkiah.                  |
| 11. " A. McG. G. Tampoe.                  | 28. " M. A. Manikkavelu Nayakar.     |
| 12. " S. H. Slater.                       | 29. Syed Ibrahim Sahib Bahadur.      |
| 13. " C. B. Cotterell.                    | 30. Mr. S. Arpudaswami Udayar.       |
| 14. " P. J. Gnanavaram Pillai.            | 31. " G. R. Premayya.                |
| 15. " R. Foulkes.                         | 32. Swami A. S. Sahajanandam.        |
| 16. " J. Bheemayya.                       | 33. Rao Sahib R. Srinivasan.         |
| 17. " V. Ch. John.                        | 34. Syed Tajudin Sahib Bahadur.      |
| 18. Mahmud Schmnad Sahib Bahadur.         | 35. Mr. V. Ramjee Rao.               |
| 19. Mr. Muppli Nayar of Kavalappara.      | 36. The Zamindar of Gollapalli.      |
| 20. Subadar-Major S. A. Nanjappa Bahadur. | 37. Mr. B. Ramachandra Reddi.        |
| 21. Mr. T. M. Narayanaswami Pillai.       | 38. Rao Bahadur C. S. Ratnasabapathi |
| 22. " N. Siva Raj.                        | Mudaliyar.                           |
| 23. " M. V. Gangadhara Siva.              | 39. The Raja of Panagal.             |
| 24. Rao Sahib L. C. Guruswami.            | 40. Khadir Mohideen Sahib Bahadur    |
| 25. Mr. V. I. Muniswami Pillai.           | 41. Mr. K. Sarabha Reddi.            |
| 26. " W. P. A. Soundara Pandia Nadar.     | 42. The Kumara Raja of Venkatsgiri.  |

*Noes.*

- |                                     |                                   |
|-------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| 1. Mr. J. A. Saldanha.              | 11. Mr. D. Narayana Raju.         |
| 2. " Sami Venkatachalam Chetti.     | 12. Dr. B. S. Mallayya.           |
| 3. " S. Satyamurti.                 | 13. Mr. K. R. Karant.             |
| 4. " T. Adinarayana Chettiyar.      | 14. " M. Narayana Rao.            |
| 5. " P. Anjaneyulu.                 | 15. " C. Ramasomayajulu.          |
| 6. " C. S. Govindarajulu Mudaliyar. | 16. " P. Bhaktavatsulu Nayudu.    |
| 7. " G. Harisarvottama Rao.         | 17. " R. Srinivasa Ayyangar.      |
| 8. " C. N. Muthuranga Mudaliyar.    | 18. " K. Koti Reddi.              |
| 9. Abdul Hamid Khan Sahib Bahadur.  | 19. " K. V. Krishnaswami Nayakar. |
| 10. Mr. K. V. R. Swami.             | 20. " C. Venkatarangam Nayudu.    |

*Ayes 42. Noes 20.*

The closure motion was carried.

\* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" The question is ' to reduce the allotment of Rs. 1,26,300 for certain experiments in the Anamalais forests by Rs. 100'."

The motion was put to the House and declared lost.

A poll was demanded and the House divided as follows :—

*Ayes.*

- |                                    |                                            |
|------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------|
| 1. Mr. Sami Venkatachalam Chetti.  | 17. Mr. R. Srinivasa Ayyangar.             |
| 2. " S. Satyamurti.                | 18. " K. Koti Reddi.                       |
| 3. " T. Adinarayana Chettiyar.     | 19. " K. V. Krishnaswami Nayakar.          |
| 4. " P. Anjaneyulu.                | 20. " C. Venkatarangam Nayudu.             |
| 5. " C. S. Govindaraja Mudaliyar.  | 21. Diwan Bahadur R. N. Arogyaswami        |
| 6. " G. Harisarvottama Rao.        | Mudaliyar.                                 |
| 7. " C. N. Muthuranga Mudaliyar.   | 22. The Zamindar of Gollapalli.            |
| 8. Abdul Hamid Khan Sahib Bahadur. | 23. The Raja of Panagal.                   |
| 9. Mr. K. V. R. Swami.             | 24. Rao Bahadur Sir A. P. Patro.           |
| 10. " D. Narayana Raju.            | 25. Diwan Bahadur P. C. Eshirajulu Nayudu. |
| 11. Dr. B. S. Mallayya.            | 26. Mr. T. K. Chidambaranatha Mudaliyar.   |
| 12. Mr. K. R. Karant.              | 27. " T. M. Narayanaswami Pillai.          |
| 13. " M. Narayana Rao.             | 28. " S. Venkayya.                         |
| 14. " C. Ramasomayajulu.           | 29. " M. A. Manikkavelu Nayakar.           |
| 15. " P. Bhaktavatsulu Nayudu.     | 30. Syed Ibrahim Sahib Bahadur.            |
| 16. " A. Kaleswara Rao.            | 31. Mr. J. A. Saldanha.                    |

*Noes.*

- |                                                 |                                         |
|-------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------|
| 1. The hon. Sir Norman Marjoribanks.            | 5. The hon. Mr. M. R. Seturainam Ayyar. |
| 2. " Khan Bahadur Muhammad Usman Sahib Bahadur. | 6. " Mr. S. Muthiah Mudaliyar.          |
| 3. " Mr. T. E. Moir.                            | 7. " Dr. P. Subbarayan.                 |
| 4. " Mr. A. Y. G. Campbell.                     | 8. Mr. F. B. Evans.                     |
|                                                 | 9. " H. A. Watson.                      |

[28th March 1928]

Noes--cont.

- |                                |                                      |
|--------------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| 10. Mr. G. T. Hoag.            | 16. Mahmud Sahamnad Sahib Bahadur.   |
| 11. " A. McG. C. Tampoe.       | 17. Mr. Muppil Nayar of Kavalappara. |
| 12. " S. H. Slater.            | 18. Sobadar-Major Nanjappa Bahadur.  |
| 13. " C. B. Cotterell.         | 19. Rao Sahib R. Srinivasan.         |
| 14. " P. J. Gnanavaram Pillai. | 20. Syed Tajadin Sahib Bahadur.      |
| 15. " R. Foulkes.              |                                      |

Ayes 31. Noes 20.

The motion was carried.

\* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" I put the demand to the vote of the House."

Mr. C. RAMASOMAYAJULU :—" I oppose the demand, Sir."

\* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" If the House passes a closure motion with regard to an amendment, the closure has to be put to the House with regard to the main motion also. I have examined the question as on a previous occasion there was some doubt. After a closure on an amendment has been carried, a closure on the main proposition has to be put to the House. If it is not carried, the House will then discuss the main proposition."

The question is that the demand be put.

The question was put to the House and carried.

\* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" The question is that 'the Government be granted a sum not exceeding Rs. 1,26,300 under Demand IV—Forest.'"

The question was put to the House and carried and the grant less Rs. 100 was made.

#### DEMAND V—REGISTRATION.

3 p.m. \* The hon. Mr. S. MUTHIAH MUDALIYAR :—" On the recommendation of His Excellency the Governor, I move—

*'That Government be granted a sum not exceeding Rs. 4,800 under Demand V—Registration.'*

" Mr. President, Sir, this question of increasing the emoluments of the officers employed in the Registration department has been engaging the attention of the Government for some time past. During the last budget for 1927-28, motions were put forward for the increase of the emoluments of these officers, and the hon. Mr. Saldanha moved a motion that members of this establishment ought to be given a higher salary and a selection grade should be introduced. The proposal now is that 5 per cent of the officers in the upper grade may be put on a selection grade on Rs. 200—10—250. This will cost for 1928-29 an additional expenditure of Rs. 4,800. This has been decided upon by Government with great hesitation. Comparing the proportion of the gazetted staff to the non-gazetted staff in the services of Government, the gazetted staff in the Registration department is 5 per cent while in other departments the gazetted staff is larger in proportion to the non-gazetted staff. These considerations moved Government to create this selection grade. Persons who are entertained as sub-registrars, after 25 years of service, will be entitled to a pay of Rs. 200, rising to 250 provided they are in the selection grade. With these few words, I move this demand."



28th March 1928]

\* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" Mr. Muniswami Pillai has given notice of a cut to discuss the recruitment of depressed class members as sub-registrars. The grant asked for is for the introduction of a selection grade. I do not think his motion is in order."

\* Mr. J. A. SALDANHA :—" Sir, I move that this allotment be reduced by Rs. 100 in order to ascertain the date from which the new appointments will take effect. I have nothing else to add."

\* The hon. Mr. S. MUTHIAH MUDALIYAR :—" I may assure the hon. Member that the idea of the Government is to give effect to it as early as possible, probably from 1st April."

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

\* Mr. K. V. R. SWAMI :—" Sir, my motion is  
*'to reduce the allotment of Rs. 4,800 for the creation of a selection grade on Rs. 200—10—250 for 5 per cent of the cadre of sub-registrars by Rs. 100.'*

"This is to discuss the question of necessity and to recommend the postponement of consideration of this question till relief is given by reduction of visiting and other fees."

\* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" The hon. Member will be in order to discuss the first portion of the question only. As regards the other portion, namely, to postpone consideration till relief is given by reduction of visiting and other fees, the Council has already voted on the point during the discussion of Demand V and I do not think the hon. Member will be in order to move that portion."

Mr. K. V. R. SWAMI :—" There are two questions involved in this. The point of view taken by the department is not the view of the tax-payers. We have been submitting that the fees in this department have been increased a good deal. Now what is wanted is not further expenditure on this department but relief to the tax-payer. We want the Government to revise the salaries of men who are getting very small wages, not even living wages, such as peons and others. There is no attempt made by Government to give relief to this class of people, but they are attempting to make better provision for men who are getting high salaries. The purpose of this Government seems to be to look after the highly paid men and neglect the low paid people. The Government have looked into the matter to find out what higher-pay officers in the other departments are getting and now attempt to level up the pay of the officers in this department, but not to level down. Because in the Judicial Department the officers are getting more pay, in this department also the salaries must be increased. That is their viewpoint. Our expenditure is increasing every day without in any way benefiting the poor man. So I oppose this grant for increased scale of pay. The hon. the Minister seems to have been quite satisfied that the first thing that he should do after taking charge is to come forward with a demand for this increased scale of pay, instead of looking into other matters which are more urgent. So, I move this token cut, with a view to point out that the difficulties of low paid men should be looked into first before higher pay is proposed for highly paid officers."

\* The hon. Mr. S. MUTHIAH MUDALIYAR :—" Mr. President, Sir, the hon. Member said that the first thing that the Government were looking to was the

[Mr. S. Muthiah Mudaliyar]

[28th March 1928]

matter of increase of pay to its officers first. Probably the hon. Member is aware that only very recently orders have been passed reducing the scale of registration fees, and as regards the attendance fee, it has been reduced from Rs. 20 to Rs. 15. The registration fees have been reduced by one-third, during the course of two months. Attendance fee has been reduced by one-fourth. So Government are not only increasing the pay of these officers, but side by side they are reducing the burden on the tax-payers also."

\* Mr. MAHMUD SCHAMNAD SAHIB :—"I rise to support this motion to point out that this increase is made at the expense of the poor tax-payer. When the attendance fee was raised from Rs. 10 to 20, it was on the clear understanding that when better times came, it would be reduced to the original level."

\* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—"Order, order. I have already said that the discussion of the reduction of attendance fees is not in order, for two reasons, because the present demand does not concern it and the House has already expressed its opinion on that question."

\* Mr. MAHMUD SCHAMNAD SAHIB :—"What I say is there are more urgent things than the raising of the pay of these officers."

\* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—"Order, order. I said that the hon. Member will not be in order to refer to the reduction of fees."

\* Mr. MAHMUD SCHAMNAD SAHIB :—"Therefore I say there are more urgent things. (Laughter.) I oppose this grant because it is not a very important thing. Here poor people are made poorer and rich people richer."

\* Mr. W. P. A. SOUNDARAPANDIA NADAR :—"I move that the question be now put."

\* Mr. ABDUL HAMID KHAN :—"Sir, before the Member from that seat got up, I saw a Member from this side getting up."

\* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—"I will draw the attention of the hon. Member to the fact that at any time after a motion has been made, even when a Member of the Council is addressing the Council or the Chair, a closure motion can be moved, and it is parliamentary practice. Under Standing Order No. 34 a motion that any meeting or business be adjourned or postponed may be moved at any time, but not so as to interrupt a speech. But under Standing Order No. 33, the interruption of a speech is not prohibited."

\* Mr. SAMI VENKATACHALAM CHETTI :—"My hon. Friend's point of order is not that the motion made by Mr. Soundarapandia Nadar was not in order but that another hon. Member who rose earlier than Mr. Soundarapandia Nadar must have caught your eye."

\* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—"Even when a Member is addressing the Chair, a closure motion can be moved."

\* Mr. SAMI VENKATACHALAM CHETTI :—"While addressing?"

\* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—"Yes."

\* Mr. S. SATYAMURTI :—"When a closure motion is moved, you have got to be satisfied that such a motion is not an abuse of the rules of the Council, or an infringement of the rights of reasonable debate. At 3 o'clock the demand was moved and it is not yet 10 minutes."

28th March 1928]

\* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" When I accepted the closure motion, the hon. Member must recognize that I had all the rules in my mind and used my discretion. The hon. Member is not justified in raising that objection."

\* Mr. S. SATYAMURTI :—" Within ten minutes."

\* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" Even one minute will suffice if according to my discretion the matter has been reasonably discussed."

\* Mr. S. SATYAMURTI :—" As you please, Sir."

The question that the question be now put was put and declared carried.

Dr. Mallayya demanded a poll and the House divided as follows :—

*Ayes.*

- |                                                 |                                                 |
|-------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------|
| 1. The hon. Sir Norman Macjoribanks.            | 26. Mr. W. P. A. Soundarapandia Nadar.          |
| 2. " Khan Bahadur Muhammad Usman Sahib Bahadur. | 27. " S. Venkiah.                               |
| 3. " Mr. T. B. Moir.                            | 28. " M. A. Manikkavelu Nayakar.                |
| 4. " A. Y. G. Campbell.                         | 29. Syed Ibrahim Sahib Bahadur.                 |
| 5. " M. R. Seturatnam Ayyar.                    | 30. Mr. S. Arpudawami Udayar.                   |
| 6. " S. Mulihah Mudaliyar.                      | 31. " K. Ramachandra Padayachi.                 |
| 7. " Dr P. Subbarayan.                          | 32. Rao Sahib R. Srinivasan.                    |
| 8. Mr. F. B. Evans                              | 33. Swami A. S. Sahajanandam.                   |
| 9. " H. A. Watson.                              | 34. Mr. G. R. Premayya.                         |
| 10. " G. T. Boag.                               | 35. " V. Ramjee Rao.                            |
| 11. " A. McG. C. Tampoe                         | 36. Diwan Bahadur R. N. Arogyaswami Mudaliyar.  |
| 12. " S. H. Slater.                             | 37. The Zamindar of Gollapalli.                 |
| 13. " C. B. Cotterell.                          | 38. Mr. B. Ramachandra Reddi.                   |
| 14. " P. J. Gnanavaram Pillai.                  | 39. Rao Bahadur C. S. Ratnasabapathi Mudaliyar. |
| 15. " R. Foulkes.                               | 40. The Raja of Panagal.                        |
| 16. " J. Bheemayya.                             | 41. Rao Bahadur Sir A. P. Patro.                |
| 17. " V. Ch. John.                              | 42. Diwan Bahadur M. Krishnan Nayar.            |
| 18. " C. R. T. Congreve.                        | 43. P. C. Ethirajulu Nayudu.                    |
| 19. " Muppil Nayar of Kavalappara.              | 44. Mr. T. K. Chidambaranatha Mudaliyar.        |
| 20. Subadar-Major Nanjappa Bahadur.             | 45. Abdul Razack Sahib Bahadur.                 |
| 21. Mr. T. M. Narayanaswami Pillai.             | 46. Khatir Mohideen Sahib Bahadur.              |
| 22. " N. Siva Raj.                              | 47. Mr. K. Sarabha Reddi.                       |
| 23. " M. V. Gangadhara Siva.                    | 48. The Kumara Raja of Venkatagiri.             |
| 24. Rao Sahib L. C. Guruswami.                  |                                                 |
| 25. Mr. V. I. Munswami Pillai.                  |                                                 |

*Noes.*

- |                                   |                                   |
|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| 1. Mr. Sami Venkateshalam Chetti. | 12. Mr. K. R. Karant.             |
| 2. " S. Satyamurti.               | 13. " M. Narayana Rao.            |
| 3. " T. Adinarayana Chettiyar.    | 14. " C. Ramasomayajulu.          |
| 4. " P. Anjaneyulu.               | 15. " J. A. Saldanha.             |
| 5. " C. S. Govindaraja Mudaliyar. | 16. " P. Bhaktavatsulu Nayudu.    |
| 6. " G. Hariharvottana Rao.       | 17. " A. Kuleswara Rao.           |
| 7. " C. N. Muthuranga Mudaliyar.  | 18. " R. Srinivasa Ayyangar.      |
| 8. " Abdul Hamid Khan.            | 19. " K. Koti Reddi.              |
| 9. " K. V. R. Swami.              | 20. " K. V. Krishnaswami Nayakar. |
| 10. " D. Narayana Raju.           | 21. " C. Venkatarangam Nayudu.    |
| 11. Dr. B. S. Mallayya.           |                                   |

*Ayes* 48.

*Noes* 21.

The closure motion was carried.

Mr. K. V. R. Swami's reduction motion was put and negatived.

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" I now put the motion for the closure on the demand to the vote of the House."

The motion was put and declared carried.



[28th March 1928]

Mr. S. Satyamurti demanded a poll and the House divided thus :—

*Ayes.*

- |                                                 |                                                 |
|-------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------|
| 1. The hon. Sir Norman Marjoribanks.            | 26. Mr. S. Venkiah.                             |
| 2. " Khan Bahadur Muhammad Usman Sahib Bahadur. | 27. " M. A. Manikkavelu Nayakar.                |
| 3. " Mr. T. E. Moir.                            | 28. Syed Ibrahim Sahib Bahadur.                 |
| 4. " " A. Y. G. Campbell.                       | 29. Mahmud Sohamnad Sahib Bahadur.              |
| 5. " " M. R. Seturatnam Ayyar.                  | 30. Mr. S. Arpudaswami Udayar.                  |
| 6. " " S. Muthiah Mudaliyar.                    | 31. " K. Ramachandra Padayachi.                 |
| 7. " Dr. P. Subbarayan.                         | 32. Rao Sahib R. Srinivasan.                    |
| 8. Mr. F. B. Evans.                             | 33. Swami A. S. Sahajanandam.                   |
| 9. " H. A. Watson.                              | 34. Mr. G. R. Premayya.                         |
| 10. " G. T. Boag.                               | 35. " V. Ramjee Rao.                            |
| 11. " A. McG. C. Tampoe.                        | 36. Diwan Bahadur R. N. Arogyaswami Mudaliyar.  |
| 12. " S. H. Slater.                             | 37. The Zamindar of Gollapalli.                 |
| 13. " C. B. Cotterell.                          | 38. Mr. B. Ramachandra Reddi.                   |
| 14. " P. J. Gnanavaram Pillai.                  | 39. Rao Bahadur C. S. Ratnasabapathi Mudaliyar. |
| 15. " R. Foulkes.                               | 40. The Raja of Panagal.                        |
| 16. " J. Bheemayya.                             | 41. Rao Bahadur Sir A. P. Petro.                |
| 17. " V. Ch. John.                              | 42. Diwan Bahadur M. Krishnan Nayar.            |
| 18. " Muppil Nayar of Kavalappara.              | 43. " P. G. Ethirajulu Nayudu.                  |
| 19. Subadar-Major Nanjappa Bahadur.             | 44. Mr. T. K. Chidambaranatha Mudaliyar.        |
| 20. Mr. T. M. Narayanaswami Pillai.             | 45. Abul Razack Sahib Bahadur.                  |
| 21. " N. Siva Raj.                              | 46. Khadir Mohidin Sahib Bahadur.               |
| 22. " M. V. Gangadhara Siva.                    | 47. Mr. K. Sarabha Reddi.                       |
| 23. Rao Sahib L. C. Guruswami.                  | 48. The Kumara Raja of Venkatagiri.             |
| 24. Mr. V. I. Muniswami Pillai.                 |                                                 |
| 25. " W. P. A. Soundarapandia Nadar.            |                                                 |

*Noes.*

- |                                    |                                   |
|------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| 1. Mr. Sami Venkatachalam Chetti.  | 12. Mr. K. R. Karant.             |
| 2. " S. Satyamurti.                | 13. " M. Narayana Rao.            |
| 3. " T. Adinarayana Chettiyar.     | 14. " C. Ramasomayajulu.          |
| 4. " P. Anjaneyulu.                | 15. " J. A. Saidanba.             |
| 5. " C. S. Govindaraja Mudaliyar.  | 16. " P. Bhaktavatsulu Nayudu.    |
| 6. " G. Harisavottama Rao.         | 17. " A. Kaleswarao Rao.          |
| 7. " C. N. Muthuranga Mudaliyar.   | 18. " R. Srinivasa Ayyangar.      |
| 8. Abdul Hamid Khan Sahib Bahadur. | 19. " K. Koti Reddi.              |
| 3-15 p.m. 9. Mr. K. V. R. Swami.   | 20. " K. V. Krishnaswami Nayakar. |
| 10. " D. Narayana Raju.            | 21. " C. Venkatarangam Nayudu.    |
| 11. Dr. B. S. Mallayya.            |                                   |

*Ayes* 48.*Noes* 21.

The closure motion on the demand was carried.

\* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" I now put the demand to the vote of the House. The question is that Government be granted a sum not exceeding Rs. 4,800 under demand V—Registration."

The demand was put to the House and declared carried

Mr. S. Satyamurti demanded a poll and the House divided thus :—

*Ayes.*

- |                                                 |                                |
|-------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| 1. The hon. Sir Norman Marjoribanks.            | 9. Mr. H. A. Watson.           |
| 2. " Khan Bahadur Muhammad Usman Sahib Bahadur. | 10. " G. T. Boag.              |
| 3. " Mr. T. E. Moir.                            | 11. " A. McG. C. Tampoe.       |
| 4. " " A. Y. G. Campbell.                       | 12. " S. H. Slater.            |
| 5. " " M. R. Seturatnam Ayyar.                  | 13. " C. B. Cotterell.         |
| 6. " " S. Muthiah Mudaliyar.                    | 14. " P. J. Gnanavaram Pillai. |
| 7. " Dr. P. Subbarayan.                         | 15. " R. Foulkes.              |
| 8. Mr. F. B. Evans.                             | 16. " J. Bheemayya.            |
|                                                 | 17. " V. Ch. John.             |

28th March 1928]

*Ayes—cont.*

18. Mahmud Schammnad Sahib Bahadur.
19. Mr. Muppil Nayar of Kavalappara.
20. Subadar-Major Nanjappa Bahadur.
21. Mr. T. M. Narayanaswami Pillai.
22. " N. Siva Raj.
23. " M. V. Gangadhara Siva.
24. Rao Sahib L. C. Guruswami.
25. Mr. V. I. Munuswami Pillai.
26. " W. P. A. Soundarapandia Nadar.
27. " S. Venkiah.
28. " M. A. Manikkavelu Nayakar.
29. Syed Ibrahim Sahib Bahadur.
30. Mr. C. R. P. Congreya.
31. " S. Arpudaswami Udayar.
32. " K. Ramachandra Padayachi.
33. Rao Sahib R. Srinivasan.
34. Swami A. S. Sahajanandam.
35. Mr. G. R. Premayya.

36. Mr. J. A. Saldanha.
37. " V. Hanjee Rao.
38. Diwan Bahadur R. N. Arogyaswami Mudaliyar.
39. The Zamindar of Gollapalli.
40. Mr. B. Ramachandra Reddi.
41. Rao Bahadur C. S. Ratnasabapathi Mudaliyar.
42. The Raja of Panagal.
43. Rao Bahadur Sir A. P. Patro.
44. Diwan Bahadur M. Krishnan Nayar.
45. " P. C. Ethirajulu Nayudu.
46. Mr. T. K. Chidambaranatha Mudaliyar.
47. Abdul Razaak Sahib Bahadur.
48. Kadir Moideen Sahib Bahadur.
49. Mr. K. Sarabha Reddi.
50. The Kumara Raja of Venkatagiri.

*Noes.*

1. Mr. Sami Venkatachalam Chetti.
2. " S. Salyamurti.
3. " T. Adinarayana Chettiyar.
4. " P. Anjneyulu.
5. " C. S. Govindaraja Mudaliyar.
6. " G. Harivarvottama Rao.
7. " C. N. Muthuranga Mudaliyar.
8. Abdul Hamid Khan Sahib Bahadur.
9. Mr. K. V. R. Swami.
10. " D. Narayana Raju.
11. Dr. B. S. Mallayya.

12. Mr. K. R. Karant.
13. " M. Narayana Rao.
14. " C. Ramasomayajulu.
15. Basheer Ahmad Sayeed Sahib Bahadur.
16. Mr. P. Bhaktavatsulu Nayudu.
17. " A. Kaleswara Rao.
18. " R. Srinivasa Ayyangar.
19. " K. Koti Reddi.
20. " K. V. Krishnaswami Nayakar.
21. " C. Venkatarangam Nayudu.

*Ayes 50.*

*Noes 21.*

The demand was carried and the grant was made.

DEMAND VI—IRRIGATION—CIVIL OFFICERS.

\* The hon. Sir NORMAN MARJORIBANKS:—"Mr. President, Sir, on the recommendation of His Excellency the Governor, I move

*'that Government be granted a sum not exceeding Rs. 28,000 under Demand VI—Irrigation—Civil Officers.'*

"This sum is to provide for the execution of repairs to works which were damaged by the cyclone last year in the Nellore and Cuddapah districts and for which estimates were not ready in time for inclusion in the budget estimates which the Council has already voted."

\* The hon. the PRESIDENT:—"Mr. Schammnad has given notice of the following motion:—

*'To reduce the allotment of Rs. 28,000 for repairs to Minor Irrigation works by Rs. 100.'*

*(To point out the damages caused by the Padne bar opened with the Collector's permission and to urge the necessity of closing the new bar without any further delay.)*

"I don't think it is in order. The further demands relate only to the Cuddapah and Nellore districts. The hon. Member wants to refer to some works in the South Kanara district. Therefore he is not in order."

[28th March 1928]

\* Mr. MAHMUD SCHAMNAD SAHIB :—"If that is the ruling, I obey, Sir."

\* Mr. B. RAMACHANDRA REDDI :—"Sir, I move

*'that the allotment of Rs. 28,000 for repairs to Minor Irrigation works be reduced by Rs. 100.'*

"My object in moving this motion is to obtain information regarding the progress of minor irrigation works in the Nellore district and the programme of work for future years, if any, before the Government. Sir, it has been pointed out that an amount of Rs. 28,000 has already been sanctioned and now for the cyclone works a special grant of Rs. 23,000 for Nellore has been granted. Though I am not in favour of cutting out even a pie of the amount that is proposed to be given by the Government for the district of Nellore, I want to point out the necessity for a programme of work for the whole district in regard to minor irrigation tanks under repairs. Last year, I think I have pointed out to the hon. the Revenue Member that it is necessary to draw up a programme of the work that has to be done by the Government in regard to these tanks. The district of Nellore is a very very vast one and several minor irrigation tanks are in disrepair. The tendency now is to spend the amount allotted very near the headquarters and therefore the taluks that are far far away from the headquarters are likely to be neglected. My suggestion with regard to this matter is to form a committee to enquire into the needs and necessities of the several localities. But if the Government think that a committee will not work satisfactorily, they can at least call for an informal conference of the several representatives of the taluks in the district. They will give the Government an idea of the amount of work that they have to do. As it is, there is every likelihood of the necessity of certain tanks being repaired, to be minimized because Government have to depend entirely on the reports of the Revenue Inspectors or the Tahsildars who are likely to minimise the necessity of certain tanks in certain localities. What I wish to point out is that non-official opinion also should be taken and examined in connexion with this question, so that they might be in a position to know the volume of work that has to be done by Government in future years for the benefit of the district. A greater portion of the district is dry and only a small portion is deltaic. To serve the needs of the greater portion which is almost in the famine zone, it is better that these minor irrigation tanks which have been abandoned for want of proper repair or have not been taken into consideration at all in regard to the extensions of the ayacut, are improved. With these suggestions and observations I would request the hon. Revenue Member to give me an assurance that the suggestion placed before him will be taken into consideration, that a committee or an informal conference of the several representatives of the district would be convened and that the question would be examined."

3-30  
p.m.

\* The hon Sir NORMAN MARJORIBANKS :—"Mr. President, Sir, these estimates at present contain provision which covers all works for which estimates are ready. It is only if there were a larger number of works than we can provide funds for that the question of a programme would arise. But at present every work for which an estimate is ready has been provided for in the grants that have been already voted or are now asked for, and I do not know what basis there is on which to frame a programme. Instructions have been issued that inspection should be made wherever necessary of



28th March 1928]

[Sir Norman Marjoribanks]

tanks in regard to which complaints have been received that they are in want of repair. The instructions to the Collector provide for keeping a register in which every tank regarding which representations have been made or complaints received or regarding which enquiry at the jamabandi shows need for examination shall be entered and that all tanks in the register shall be systematically inspected and estimates prepared where necessary. We have so far managed to provide money for all estimates that have been sent in. But it is not possible to know beforehand exactly every tank that may be in need of repair in order to have estimates ready for all tanks. It is much better to do what we have ready and so get on with the work than to try to frame theoretical programmes to which in all probability we may not be able to keep."

\* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" Does the hon. Member press his motion ? "

Mr. B. RAMACHANDRA REDDI : --" No, Sir."

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

\* Mr. S. SATYAMURTI :—" Mr. President, Sir, this demand represents a very lax conscience on the part of the Finance Department and also on the part of the hon. the Revenue Member in trying to place this additional demand or further demand before this House. The explanatory note, Mr. President, reads thus :

' The Collector of Cuddapah reported that about 70 minor irrigation tanks in his district had been breached or damaged during the recent cyclone and he required a provision of Rs. 55,000 for 1928-29 for restoring and repairing the works. Increased provision was accordingly made in the Budget Estimate.'

" The story should have stopped with that. But in Madras we work on different principles. The report continues :

' The Collector has since asked for an additional grant of Rs. 5,000. The Board of Revenue has supported the Collector's application.'

" And, ergo, it must come before the House as a ' Further demand '. I should like to know when the Collector budgeted for only Rs. 55,000 for repairing 70 minor irrigation works, why he did not include the Rs. 5,000. Secondly, Sir, why is this Rs. 5,000 wanted, for what purpose and whether the Board of Revenue or the Government in its turn ask the Collector why he made this mistake in sending up his first estimates ?

" Then, Sir, we are told that the Collector has asked for this additional grant. And, why was it not sent before the Budget was finally presented before this House ? ' The Board of Revenue has supported the Collector's application.' I daresay, but where does the Board of Revenue come in in framing the budget which is to be placed before this House ? But stranger things follow : for, in the second paragraph, they say :

' The Board of Revenue was asked to report whether any additional grant for 1928-29 would be necessary on account of repairs to minor irrigation works damaged by the cyclone in the Nellore district.'

" Sir, ' Further demands ' can be asked for, under your ruling, for any new matter which may come up unexpectedly or out of commitments on the part of the Government in regard to obligations incurred or events happening after the . . . ."

\* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" Order, order. I do not remember having said that any demands can be made arising from unexpected causes. I simply said that only new works are covered by the further grants."

[28th March 1928]

\* Mr. S. SATYAMURTI :—“ Yes, Sir. Therefore it must be a case of any spending department by itself putting up proposals for new works and satisfying the Treasury or the Finance Department here that owing to some failure of calculation or foresight on their part they were compelled not to ask for provision for that and owing to subsequent discovery of these defects they have now asked for an increased provision. But, Sir, here we are told that the Board of Revenue was asked to report. By whom? Did the Government want the Board of Revenue to tell them if they wanted an additional sum of money? It is certainly reversing the whole process. Instead of the spending departments coming with proposals for additional grants, which ought to be very carefully scrutinized by the Government and then placed before the House, we have here the process reversed. The Board of Revenue is asked, I presume, by the Government, to report whether any additional grant would be necessary on account of the repairs. The Board reports that the Collector of Nellore requires an allotment of Rs. 55,000. Already in the budget they have provided Rs. 27,000 for maintenance and repairs. Therefore, the Board suggests an additional provision of Rs. 28,000. That, Sir, is certainly an abuse of the power vested in the Government of bringing further demands, under our Rules and Standing Orders as they stand, because it is not the case of a spending department approaching the Government, but the Government approaching the spending department and asking whether they wanted an additional grant. It seems to me, Sir, that if that goes on, it certainly puts a premium on lax estimates being sent by the spending departments, on the Finance Department not exercising a scrutiny, which I know the Treasury exercises over all spending departments in Great Britain, for example. I recognize, Sir, that the Finance Department here does not stand on the same footing towards other spending departments as the Treasury in England does. But even apart from that, it certainly seems to be strange that the Board of Revenue should be asked by the Government to suggest whether they wanted an additional demand. At that rate, Sir, we would be only encouraging the spending departments to send up truncated demands in the hope that either by themselves *suo motu* or at the instance of the Government they can later send these so-called further demands.

“ Although on the merits, Sir, these repairs may be excellent and urgently required and indispensable to the unfortunate people of Cuddapah and Nellore who have suffered from the evil effects of the cyclone, I still suggest that these demands should be carefully scrutinized, unless this House is going unconsciously but surely to give up its small control over the spending departments of the Government of Madras. For these reasons, Sir, I oppose this demand.”

\* The hon. Sir NORMAN MAJORIBANKS :—“ Sir, the figures for the budget estimates have to be framed by a certain date and sent in by the Board of Revenue. The cyclone happened after the date on which the budget estimate was received by the Government and so naturally any application for further grants that were required had to come in later. The Collector of Cuddapah seems to have been more prompt in making his demand than the Collector of Nellore. But we knew there had been a cyclone and that some works had been damaged and so we asked for estimates for the repairs necessary, and on receipt of the report and estimates we have approached the House for money. I do not see anything wrong in it, Sir.”

28th March 1928]

\* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" I take it that the House is ready for a vote on the question. The question is that Government be granted a sum not exceeding Rs. 28,000 under Demand VI—Irrigation."

The motion was put to the House and carried and the grant was made.

DEMAND VII—IRRIGATION—PUBLIC WORKS OFFICERS AND ELECTRICITY.

\* The hon. Mr. A. Y. G. CAMPBELL :—" Mr. President, Sir, on the recommendation of His Excellency the Governor, I beg to move

*'that Government be granted a sum not exceeding Rs. 3,900 under Demand VII—Irrigation—Public Works Officers and Electricity.'*

" Sir, this sum is intended to provide for the appointment of a Junior Electrical Inspector to the Government. As hon. Members of the House are aware, the number of electric supply undertakings is increasing; there is a general demand throughout the Presidency for further spread of the use of electricity. At present we have only one Electrical Inspector and he has more work than he can do and it is essential that he should be given relief as soon as possible. It is therefore proposed to appoint a Junior Electrical Inspector on a pay and terms similar to those sanctioned for the Madras Engineering Service."

\* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" The question is that Government be granted a sum not exceeding Rs. 3,900 under Demand VII."

\* Mr. J. A. SALDANHA :—" Sir, I propose to reduce the allotment by Rs. 100 in order to enquire into the qualification required for the post of this office of Junior Electrical Inspector."

" First of all, Sir, I want to know whether the selection will be made from among the Indians, provided of course they are qualified by examination and training. Secondly I wish to know what are the exact qualifications required of the candidates for this post."

\* The hon. Mr. A. Y. G. CAMPBELL :—" Mr. President, Sir, the necessary qualifications are that he should be Graduate in Electrical Engineering, have undergone post-graduate training in the Institute of Science in Bangalore or in some similar institute and have had three years subsequent practical experience in electrical engineering. I feel sure that we shall be able to find an Indian having these qualifications."

\* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" Does the hon. Member propose to press his motion ?"

Mr. J. A. SALDANHA :—" No, Sir."

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

\* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" I will now put the whole demand to the vote of the House."

At this stage Mr. Basheer Ahmad Sayeed rose to speak.

\* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" The hon. Member has given notice of a cut motion to discuss the question of reducing the rate per unit of electric current to the pre-war level in the city. I am of opinion that it is not in order, as it has nothing to do with the appointment of an Electrical Inspector."

\* Mr. BASHEER AHMAD SAYEED :—" May I make a submission, Sir ?"

\* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" Yes."

\* Mr. BASHEER AHMAD SAYEED :—" Sir, the demand is for the appointment of an Electrical Inspector and the explanatory note says that the work



[Mr. Basheer Ahmad Sayeed] [28th March 1928]

of the Inspector has increased on account of the increased works and other new schemes brought into effect. So that correspondingly there is a larger income to the departments from the schemes that are being brought into effect. I have only tabled this motion, Sir, for a consideration of the reduction of the rate of electric current per unit. Since the demand relates to the Electrical department and the Electrical Inspector, I thought this the proper occasion for pointing out the need for a reduction in the rate per unit of electricity at least in the city if not outside the city."

Mr. SAMI VENKATACHALAM CHETTI:—"I find, Sir, from what my hon. Friend from the Muhammadan constituency has said, that an application was made to the Government of Madras for the reduction in the unit rate of electricity supplied in this city. The Government have passed certain orders presumably on the recommendation of their expert officer, the Electrical Engineer."

\* The hon. the PRESIDENT:—"This officer is yet to be appointed."

\* Mr. SAMI VENKATACHALAM CHETTI:—"It is to give relief to the existing Electrical Inspector that a Junior Inspector is to be appointed. So, naturally, it is an additional convenience to the Electrical Inspector who is already in office. I should only like to make this submission that the question of which my Friend has given notice is in order in view of the explanation that I have submitted above."

\* The hon. the PRESIDENT:—"However interesting the point is for discussion, I am afraid I cannot allow a discussion unconnected with the further demand that is directly for the consideration of the House."

"I now take that the House is ready for a vote on the question. The question is that Government be granted a sum not exceeding Rs. 3,900 under Demand VII—Irrigation—Public Works Officers and Electricity."

The demand was put to the House and carried and the grant was made.

\* The hon. Sir NORMAN MARJORIBANKS:—"Mr. President, Sir, on the recommendation of His Excellency the Governor, I move

*'that Government be granted a sum not exceeding Rs. 71,100 under Demand VII—Irrigation—Public Works Officers and Electricity.'*

"Sir, at present the irrigation of the Divi island is effected by means of a pumping system and for the purpose of the engines there we have to use oil. This oil at present is conveyed by train to Duggirala railway station and from there pumped to punts in the canal and these punts are towed down the canal to Adivipalayam lock, and from there taken by steamer to Divi island. It is found that these punts can only with difficulty be towed along the canal and that there are delays. This has jeopardized the working of the engines. It is therefore proposed to free the system from these chances of breakdown by taking the oil by train to Repalle railway station and from there laying a pipe line straight into the punts in the river from where the steam launch will take them to Divi island.

"It is estimated that this new system may be a little more costly, but it is considered that the difference in cost would be more than compensated for by the security of the system against breaking down, and a breakdown with cessation of water-supply might have most serious consequences to the crops. It is for that reason, Sir, that this proposal has been examined and recommended by the Finance Committee. I therefore commend it to the House."

28th March 1928]

\* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—"The question is that Government be granted a sum not exceeding Rs. 71,100 under 'Demand VII—Irrigation—Public Works Officers and Electricity'."

MR. SAMI VENKATACHALAM CHETTI :—"Mr. President, Sir, it is generally believed that the Government neglect these canals with a view to favour the railway lines having greater traffic . . ."

\* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—"This relates only to a pipe line for taking oil."

\* MR. SAMI VENKATACHALAM CHETTI :—"I am coming to that point. It is generally believed that the Government neglect these canals just with a view to favour railway lines having greater traffic. So far as the Kistna canal is concerned—I may perhaps be wrong—it is kept in the present condition at least for the sake of conveying the oil from the Repalle railway station. I am only afraid that in case the present project is sanctioned, even the little attention that this canal is receiving at the hands of the Government on account of the urgent necessity of conveying oil, may be withdrawn, and the canal will become silted up, thus putting an end to the little traffic that is now going on there."

\* The hon. Sir NORMAN MAJORIBANKS :—"Mr. President, Sir, I can assure the hon. Member that it is not in the interests of the railways that this scheme has been devised—the railway also is a District Board Railway. Whether the oil is taken by the pipes or whether it is to be taken by the canal will make no difference in the standard of maintenance of the canal. I can assure the hon. Member that we shall not relax our care of the canal if we are allowed to take the oil by a pipe line."

MR. P. ANJANEYULU :—"Mr. President, Sir, while not at all being unfavourable to the scheme of any improvement which will be useful to the ryots of the Divi taluk, I should like to submit to the Members of the House that a sum of Rs. 71,100 on this project may not be an immediate necessity, so far as I know the needs of the Divi taluk. I do not think that the present condition of my district would justify a sum of Rs. 71,100 being spent on this small project without a corresponding return, while a sum of Rs. 50,000 invested on the improvement of tanks in the upland tanks of Painad and Vinukonda will relieve not only the famines which appear year after year but will also ensure the supply of water during the summer season and irrigate an area of not less than 5,000 acres. It may be that at times oil is not supplied to the pumping installation evenly, but if when the canal is full of water for ten months in the year oil is stored up somewhere near the installation—after all, the canal is closed for traffic only for two months in the year—this sum of Rs. 71,100 can be easily saved. It is practically a small business proposition. I cannot guess what is behind this scheme, who adumbrated it or how the Finance Committee passed it. I do not know all that, but I know this much, that as a simple business proposition, the oil can be stored during ten months out of the twelve months of the year, so as to be available for the remaining two months also when the canal is closed, and thus this amount of Rs. 71,100 may be saved. On the other hand, if Rs. 50,000 is spent on some other project in the district, there will be a good return for the Government, and more than 5,000 acres will be irrigated. For this reason, Sir, I request the hon. the Revenue Member who has a much better knowledge of the revenue system in my district as Collector some

[Mr. P. Anjaneyulu]

[28th March 1928]

years ago of that district, to throw better light on this matter, so that the ryots of my district and the hon. Members of this House may know how it is beneficial, or to put it off to the next meeting of the Council, so that we may have in the meantime fuller details of this project. With your permission, Sir, I request that this matter may be adjourned to the next meeting of the Council."

\* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" Does the hon. Member propose to move an adjournment of the motion ? "

Mr. P. ANJANEYULU :—" Yes, Sir, with your permission, I am doing that."

\* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" He must really have given an indication of that before. Having made a speech opposing the motion—especially the first part of the speech was not at all relevant to the adjournment motion—it is not open to him now to move for adjournment. I cannot at this stage allow the adjournment motion."

Mr. P. ANJANEYULU :—" Then I shall say, as a piece of personal explanation, that I made those remarks to show . . . ,"

\* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" I have already said that the hon. Member is perfectly in order in opposing the motion. If really the hon. Member wanted to propose an adjournment of the subject, he must have mentioned it to me."

Mr. P. ANJANEYULU :—" I will take another opportunity, or some other friend will help me in the matter, Sir."

\* Dr. B. S. MALLAYYA :—" Sir, I should like to know from the hon. the Revenue Member what is the quantity of the oil that is proposed to be pumped along this pipe line, what is the quantity consumed daily by the engines, and whether the engines are going to work during the monsoon time also. I should like to have statistics about the working hours of the engines, their horsepower, whether the pipe line is of the same dimension as the one which the Anglo-Persian Oil Company had from Basrah down to the Mediterranean, whether the oil is going to be pumped throughout the day, etc. Is it not possible for the Government to have a tank near this station built up and filled up in a couple of hours, instead of having a long pipe line for 20 or 30 miles, exposed to damage by any unruly elements at any time and carrying this dangerous inflammable material? I should like to know, Sir, whether this is to be done simply to oblige some engineer who has some idea of putting up a pipe line, and whether it could not be done by taking oil in bulk straightaway in a day or two and storing it there on the spot and utilizing it whenever necessary. What is the necessity for this pipe line? If the oil is to be flowing along at the rate of one-tenth of a gallon per hour, what is the use of having this pipe line at all? "

Mr. A. KALESWARA RAO :—" Mr. President, Sir, unless there is a great necessity and an absolute necessity, such a large sum as Rs. 71,100 should not be spent on this scheme. Somehow the oil has been supplied for a long time, and it has been going on, whether satisfactorily or not, and so before we accept this motion and sanction the grant, it is necessary that we should have some information about the present state of things, how it is found to be a necessity and whether it is impossible to convey the oil direct without spending such a big sum as Rs. 71,100.



28th March 1928] [Mr. A. Kaleswara Rao]

I therefore move, Sir, that this subject be adjourned now and taken up at the next meeting. In the meantime, we may get fuller information and better details. I move that this subject be adjourned to the next meeting."

Mr. BASHEER AHMAD SAYEED :—" I second it, Sir."

\* Diwan Bahadur R. N. AROGYASWAMI MUDALIYAR :—" Mr. President, I recognize that the work will perhaps give greater security in the matter of oil supply to the engines . . ."

\* Mr. G. HARISARVOTTAMA RAO :—" I rise to a point of order, Sir. A motion for adjournment has been made and seconded. Is the hon. Member in order now in speaking after that ?"

\* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" He is in order."

\* Diwan Bahadur R. N. AROGYASWAMI MUDALIYAR :—" I should like to have some assurance from the hon. the Revenue Member as to the urgency of the thing. I remember there have been one or two years when the canal water ran down much earlier than usual, and then of course there was a good deal of trouble about oil supply. I think there is some storage for oil available at Divi which is likely to give a supply for two or three months. I do not however know exactly for how long the storage will be available, but since those days, the Government have carried out certain improvements to the Bezvada aicut, and I believe there has been considerable improvement in the water-supply for navigation down the Bank canal. I presume the hon. the Revenue Member is aware of it and he has probably satisfied himself on that score. But I should like to have his assurance that he still thinks that the canal supply for navigation still remains unsatisfactory. I merely want to have the information, Sir."

\* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" I take it that the House is ready for a vote on the Demand."

\* Mr. G. HARISARVOTTAMA RAO :—" May I know, Sir, what happened to the adjournment motion which has been moved ?"

\* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" It was never put to me. The hon. Member made a speech and then said at the end of it that he wanted to move for an adjournment of the subject."

Mr. S. SATYAMURTI :—" Can I now move for the adjournment, Sir ?"

\* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" Oh, yes."

Mr. S. SATYAMURTI :—" I beg to move that this subject do stand adjourned to the next meeting of the Council."

\* Mr. G. HARISARVOTTAMA RAO :—" I second it, Sir."

\* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" The question is that this subject be adjourned to the next meeting of the Legislative Council."

\* The hon. Sir NORMAN MARJORIBANKS :—" Sir, I am not aware of any 4 p.m. reason why this subject should be adjourned. I think there is some misapprehension as to the nature of the proposal. Whether the oil is stored at Divi or not, it has to be got there somehow. It has been submitted to the House that if the oil is taken to the nearest railway station, Repalle and then by pipe line, it would ensure an unfailing and reliable supply and that the other method of taking it 52 miles by canal in punts and then towing the punts by steamer up and across the river is disadvantageous to the interests of the public."

[28th March 1928]

\* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—"The question is that the consideration of this motion be postponed till the next session of the Council."

The adjournment motion was put and declared lost. A poll was demanded and the House divided thus:—

*Ayes.*

- |                                           |                                         |
|-------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------|
| 1. Mr. Sami Venkatachalam Chetti.         | 10. Mr. D. Narayana Raju.               |
| 2. " S. Satyamurti.                       | 11. Dr. B. S. Mallayya.                 |
| 3. " P. Anjaneyulu.                       | 12. Mr. C. Ramasomayajulu.              |
| 4. " C. S. Govindaraja Mudaliyar.         | 13. Basheer Ahmad Sayeed Sahib Bahadur. |
| 5. " G. Hariharvottama Rao.               | 14. Mr. P. Bhaktavatsulu Nayudu.        |
| 6. " C. N. Muthuranga Mudaliyar.          | 15. " A. Kaleswara Rao.                 |
| 7. " Abdul Hamid Khan.                    | 16. " K. Koti Reddi.                    |
| 8. " K. V. R. Swami.                      | 17. " K. V. Krishnaswami Nayakar.       |
| 9. " K. P. V. S. Muhammad Meera Ravattar. | 18. " C. Venkatarangam Nayudu.          |

*Noes.*

- |                                                 |                                            |
|-------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------|
| 1. The hon. Sir Norman Marjoribanks.            | 22. Mr. T. M. Narayanaswami Pillai.        |
| 2. " Khan Bahadur Muhammad Usman Sahib Bahadur. | 23. " N. Siva Raj.                         |
| 3. " Mr. T. E. Moir.                            | 24. Rao Sahib L. C. Guruswami.             |
| 4. " " A. Y. G. Campbell.                       | 25. Mr. V. I. Munuswami Pillai.            |
| 5. " " M. R. Seturatnam Ayyar.                  | 26. " W. P. A. Soundarapandia Nadar.       |
| 6. " " S. Muthiah Mudaliyar.                    | 27. " S. Venkayya.                         |
| 7. " Dr. P. Subbarayan.                         | 28. " M. A. Manickavelu Nayakar.           |
| 8. Mr. F. B. Evans.                             | 29. Syed Ibrahim Sahib Bahadur.            |
| 9. " H. A. Watson.                              | 30. Mr. C. R. T. Congreve.                 |
| 10. " G. T. Boag.                               | 31. " S. Arpudaswami Udayar.               |
| 11. " A. McG. C. Tampoe.                        | 32. " K. Kamachandra Padayachi.            |
| 12. " S. H. Sater.                              | 33. " G. R. Premayya.                      |
| 13. " C. B. Cotterell.                          | 34. Swami Sahajanandam.                    |
| 14. " P. J. Gnanavaram Pillai.                  | 35. Rao Sahib R. Srinivasan.               |
| 15. " R. Foulkes.                               | 36. Mr. V. Ramjes Rao.                     |
| 16. " C. D. Appava Chettiyar.                   | 37. The Raja of Panagal.                   |
| 17. " A. B. Shetty.                             | 38. Rao Bahadur Sir A. P. Patro.           |
| 18. " J. Bheemayya.                             | 39. Diwan Bahadur M. Krishnan Nayar.       |
| 19. Mahmud Shammud Sahib Bahadur.               | 40. " P. O. Ethirajulu Nayudu.             |
| 20. Mr. Muppil Nayar of Kavalappara.            | 41. Muhammad Kadir Motideen Sahib Bahadur. |
| 21. Subadar-Major Nanjappa Bahadur.             |                                            |

*Ayes* 18.      *Noes* 41.

The motion for adjournment was lost.

\* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—"I think the House is ready to vote on the demand. (After a pause.) The question is Government be granted a sum not exceeding Rs. 71,100 under Demand VII—Irrigation—Public Works officers and Electricity."

The demand was put and carried and the grant was made.

## DEMAND IX—GENERAL ADMINISTRATION—LEGISLATIVE BODIES.

\* The hon. Sir NORMAN MARJORIBANKS :—"On the recommendation of His Excellency the Governor I move

*'Government be granted a sum not exceeding Rs. 20,000 under Demand IX—General Administration—Legislative Bodies.'*

"This expense will be incurred in connexion with the payment of halting allowance to hon. Members of this House for one day before and one day after the sitting of the Council as voted by the Council the other day. If there is a division on the motion, official Members will not vote."

28th March 1928]

\* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—"The question is Government be granted a sum not exceeding Rs. 20,000 under Demand IX—General Administration—Legislative Bodies. (After a pause.) I see Mr. Basheer Ahmed Sayeed has given notice of a motion for holding a meeting or two of the Council during the months of April, May, June and July. I do not think it comes under this demand. This demand is intended for the payment of daily allowance to hon. Members of this House for one day before and one day after the sitting of the Council. The hon. Member will explain the bearing his motion has on this demand. (After a pause.) I think it will be better if the Leader of the Party explains."

\* Mr. SAMI VENKATACHALAM CHETTI :—"It seems to me the motion comes under this demand in this way. This is a recommendation to the Government to hold more sessions of the Council, in which case the demand will have to be increased and the only way of increasing it is by means of cuts."

\* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—"If really Government came forward with a demand for increase of travelling allowance the question will be quite pertinent. But here the demand is for an increase in the halting allowance of the Members for one day previous and one day after the sitting of the Council. Hence the motion is not in order."

\* Mr. BASHEER AHMAD SAYEED :—"There are two other clauses in the cut motion."

\* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—"They too are not in order."

\* Mr. BASHEER AHMAD SAYEED :—"Sir, these affect the privileges of the Members. The halting allowance is a privilege of the Members."

\* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—"The hon. Member will resume his seat. He is not in order."

\* Mr. J. A. SALDANHA :—"I move to reduce the allotment of Rs. 20,000 for halting allowances to Members of the Legislative Council by Rs. 100 to make it clear that the extra halting allowance will be given to Members of the Legislative Council, arriving at Madras from outside, the day before and staying at Madras the day after the Council meeting. In moving this motion I wish to say that Members who take the trouble to attend the Council have hardly time to prepare for the subjects that will be brought before the Council if they arrive in Madras on the day of the meeting. Hence they have to go over here a day earlier."

Dr. B. S. MALLAYYA :—"Why not ten days before?"

\* Mr. J. A. SALDANHA :—"Similarly, also after the session they have to stay for a day to wind up matters. For these reasons I beg to move this cut."

\* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—"Will the hon. the Revenue Member make it clear?" (Laughter.)

The hon. Sir NORMAN MARJORIBANKS :—"If I knew what the difficulty is I might clear it; but I am sorry to say his speech was inaudible to me. So I should suggest that if the hon. Member has any difficulty, he may commit it to paper and address Government and he will get a reply."

\* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—"As the Council has already expressed its view on the question, I shall put the demand to vote."

Mr. G. HARISARVOTTAMA RAO :—"No discussion?"



[28th March 1928]

\* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" The merits of the question have already been discussed by a vote."

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" The question is Government be granted a sum not exceeding Rs. 20,000 under Demand IX—General Administration—Legislative Bodies."

The demand was put to vote and declared lost. A poll was demanded and the House divided thus :—

*Ayes.*

- |                                    |                                          |
|------------------------------------|------------------------------------------|
| 1. Mr. P. J. Gnanavaram Pillai.    | 11. Swami A. S. Sahajanandam.            |
| 2. " R. Foulkes.                   | 12. Rao Sahib R. Srinivasan.             |
| 3. Mahmud Schamanad Sahib Bahadur. | 13. Mr. J. A. Saldanha.                  |
| 4. Mr. M. V. Gangadhara Siva.      | 14. Diwan Bahadur K. N. Arogyaswami      |
| 5. Rao Sahib L. O. Guruswami.      | Mudaliyar.                               |
| 6. Mr. V. I. Munuswami Pillai.     | 15. The Raja of Ramnad.                  |
| 7. " S. Venkayya.                  | 16. Mr. Ramanatha Goenka.                |
| 8. " S. Arpudawami Udayar.         | 17. The Zamindar of Seithur.             |
| 9. " K. Ramachandra Padayachi.     | 18. The Zamindar of Gollapalli.          |
| 10. " G. R. Premayya.              | 19. Mr. T. K. Chidambatanatha Mudaliyar. |

*Noes.*

- |                                   |                                  |
|-----------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| 1. Mr. C. N. Muthuranga Mudaliyar | 5. Mr. B. Ramachandra Reldi.     |
| 2. Dr. B. S. Mallayya.            | 6. Khadir Mohidin Sahib Bahadur. |
| 3. Mr. K. Koli Kaddi.             | 7. Kumara Raja of Venkatagiri.   |
| 4. " C. Venkatarangam Nayadu.     |                                  |

*Ayes 19 Noes 7.*

The motion was adopted and the grant was made.

## DEMAND X--GENERAL ADMINISTRATION--SECRETARIATS--RESERVED

4-15 P.M. \* The hon. Sir NORMAN MAJORIBANKS :—" Mr. President, Sir, on the recommendation of His Excellency the Governor I move

*'that Government be granted a sum not exceeding Rs. 3,000 under Demand X—General Administration—Secretariats—Reserved.'*

" This sum is required to meet the cost of the Committee which is drafting a Bill on Malabar tenancy law. It was hoped that this work would be over by the end of March. But owing to the absence of one member and certain new suggestions brought forward by another member which had to be circulated to all the other members, the President of the Committee informed the Government that it would not be possible for the work to be completed and the report signed before the third week of April. The estimated extra expenditure will be Rs. 3,000. If the report is signed earlier, of course the expenses will be less."

\* Mr. J. A. SALDANHA :—" Mr. President, I beg to move

*'that the allotment of Rs. 3,000 be reduced by Rs. 100.'*

in order to suggest that a conference be held of Malabar and South Kanara Members of the Legislative Council to represent Malabar landlords' and tenants' interests before the Bill is finally approved.

" Sir, this is a subject of great importance to the landlords and tenants of Malabar. The Committee is enquiring into the points of dispute and . . ."

28th March 1928]

\* The RAJA OF RAMNAD :—" On a point of order, Sir. The demand is to meet the cost on account of the extension of the term of the Malabar Tenancy Committee. The Committee has apparently finished its work but not signed the report. Will it be in order at this stage to suggest what the Government or the Committee should do in the matter of investigating the question of Malabar tenancy? I respectfully submit that it will not be in order."

\* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" The hon. Mover has clearly mentioned in his motion that he wants to suggest a conference of the tenants and landlords of Malabar before the Bill is finally approved by the Government. He is not prepared to vote for the grant until the Government gives him an assurance to that effect. I think the subject is pertinent to the motion."

\* Mr. J. A. SALDANHA :—" Sir, I do not wish to take the time of the House, especially the time of the Raja of Ramnad. I represent a large number of Syrian Christians of Malabar. Naturally I desire that the Members of the Legislative Council representing the interests concerned should be called to a conference to discuss the points of the Bill before it is finally approved."

\* The hon. Sir NORMAN MARJORIBANKS :—" Mr. President, Sir, Government have not yet seen the report of the Committee or the Bill. I do not think we can possibly make any statement as to what we are going to do when we get them and examine them. I would only tell the House that I understand that the report of the Committee is more or less an agreed report and I would ask it not to refuse funds to enable this good work to be finished. When the Government have got the report before them they will consider such suggestions as that which has now been made."

\* Mr. ABDUL HAMID KHAN :—" Sir, I was rather surprised at the answer given by the hon. the Revenue Member. I do not know how this figure of Rs. 3,000 was arrived at if Government do not know what they are going to do hereafter. I should like to be enlightened on this subject, because Government should have thought of some procedure that they are going to adopt."

\* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" Let us dispose of this amendment first. Does the hon. Member, Mr. Saldanha, wish to press his motion?"

\* Mr. J. A. SALDANHA :—" I could not at all hear the hon. the Revenue Member, Sir. Anyhow I do not press it very much." (Laughter.)

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

\* Mr. ABDUL HAMID KHAN :—" I was rather surprised to hear the remarks of the hon. the Revenue Member that they had not decided what they were going to do hereafter. I want to know by what process of calculation they arrived at the figure of Rs. 3,000. Have they proposed to call a conference of the landlords and tenants of Malabar?"

\* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" The hon. Member has withdrawn his motion and I do not think that subject can be discussed."

\* Mr. G. HARISARVOTTAMA RAO :—" Sir, I oppose this grant. This is an old story. We have had this Malabar Tenancy Committee often. That Committee was appointed above the head of this House."

[28th March 1928]

\* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" I think the House has already expressed during this session its opinion regarding the Malabar Tenancy Committee. It has only to give its vote now . . . "

\* Mr. G. HARISARVOTTAMA RAO :—" No, Sir. "

\* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" I think that a resolution on this subject was adopted or a grant was refused. "

\* Mr. BASHEER AHMAO SAYEED :—" There was an adjournment motion, Sir. "

\* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" The House has already given its vote regarding the Malabar Tenancy Committee. I do not think further discussion of the committee on its merits is permissible. The House has simply to vote on the grant. "

\* Mr. BASHEER AHMAO SAYEED :—" Can there not be a reference to what has taken place in the House on this subject ? "

\* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" I have reminded the House that the adjournment motion on this subject was carried. Therefore the House cannot now discuss the merits of the question. "

\* Mr. G. HARISARVOTTAMA RAO :—" I thank you, Mr. President, for reminding me that this House has passed an adjournment motion on this question. Having passed this adjournment motion no self-respecting Member of this House would think of voting for this grant. We have condemned the procedure of the Government, and their methods have been discredited in this matter. That we should now be approached with this grant is adding insult to injury. We have already expressed how we have been injured and we have emphatically protested against it. We have said that the whole thing was a bungling. That we should be asked money for the extension of the term of the committee is a tragedy that can occur only under a constitution like this. The last vestige of democracy would disappear if this House should stultify itself by voting for this grant. I commend that this grant should be thrown out, even by the prospective Law Member and by his friends who are wedded to the maintenance of the present Ministry and the present Government as it stands. We should not stultify ourselves; we should not lose our self-respect; we should not pass the adjournment motion and in the same breath vote for this grant. "

\* Rao Bahadur Sir A. P. PATRO :—" Sir, it is rather surprising that this grant should be opposed. Subsequent to the adjournment motion the House has voted for a supplementary grant of Rs. 10,000 for this purpose. This extra amount is necessary for payment of the salaries of the committee for work done and there is no question of stultifying ourselves by our voting for this grant. "

(Mr. J. A. Saldanha rose to speak.)

\* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" I do not think a discussion on the merits of the question is permitted. "

\* Mr. J. A. SALDANHA :—" I want to oppose this, Sir. "

\* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" By vote ? "

\* Mr. J. A. SALDANHA :—" I want to give my reasons and I have got some valid reasons for it. " (Laughter.)

\* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" The House will hear the reasons. "



28th March 1928]

\* Mr. J. A. SALDANHA :—" Sir, the figures are somewhat puzzling to us. We have already sanctioned Rs. 44,000. A demand of Rs. 1,000 was sanctioned by this House with the support of the Justice Party who had already begun manœuvring for some purpose or another. In this budget we have already granted another Rs. 5,900 altogether making a total of about Rs. 50,000. It is simply astounding that we are now asked for another Rs. 3,000. How on earth this Rs. 3,000 is to be added to Rs. 50,000 is a mystery to us. The whole committee and their movements are a mystery to us."

\* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" I request the hon. Member not to go into the merits of the question."

\* Mr. J. A. SALDANHA :—" The reasons urged by Diwan Bahadur Krishnan Nayar against the original grant of Rs. 30,000 exist with greater force now. If the hon. Member Sir Patro has abdicated Justice ideals we cannot abdicate our rights for opposing such an outrageous demand as this. Why was not this Rs. 3,000 demanded when the budget was presented to us? They got Rs. 10,000 under a supplemental demand; they got Rs. 5,900 only recently and now they come forward with a demand for another Rs. 3,000. Can this House with any sense of dignity sanction this? (A voice: 'No.') Are we lost to all sense of dignity? (Hear, hear.) I will not be a party to sanctioning an outrageous demand. The hon. the Revenue Member comes quietly with a demand for a further sum of Rs. 3,000. I ask why was this not asked by him—of course he is a very fair-minded man. (Laughter.) I should like to ask him and the hon. Mr. Moir how this amount has crept in as a further grant."

The hon. Dr. P. SUBBARAYAN :—" Crept in?"

\* Mr. J. A. SALDANHA :—" Yes, crept in, and very surreptitiously crept in. I do hope that every Member of this House with any sense of dignity, with any sense of justice (laughter) will vote against this demand."

\* The hon. Sir NORMAN MARJORIBANKS :—" I am sorry, Sir, that the hon. Member who spoke last was so indignant. The amount of Rs. 5,900 represents the pay for the month of March to be paid on the 1st of April. We expected that the committee would finish their labours on the 31st March; but the term of the committee has had to be extended for three weeks in April and the amount of Rs. 3,000 represents the pay for the period in April which is expected to be three weeks. Really nothing has 'crept in,' Sir, surreptitiously or otherwise."

The demand was put and declared lost.

A poll was demanded and the House divided thus :—

*Ayes.*

1. The hon. Sir. Norman Marjoribanks.
2. " Khan Bahadur Muhammad Usman Sahib Bahadur.
3. " Mr. T. E. Moir.
4. " " A. Y. G. Campbell.
5. " " M. R. Seturatnam Ayyar.
6. " " S. Muthiah Mudaliyar.
7. " Dr. P. Subbarayan.
8. Mr. F. B. Evans.
9. " H. A. Watson
10. " G. T. Boag.
11. " A. McG. C. Tampoe.

12. Mr. S. H. Slater.
13. " C. B. Cotterell.
14. " P. J. Gnanavaram Pillai.
15. " E. Foulkes.
16. " C. D. Appavu Chettiyar.
17. " A. B. Shetty.
18. " J. Bhoemayya.
19. Mahmud Schahmad Sahib Bahadur.
20. Subadar-Major S. A. Nanjappa Bahadur.
21. Mr. T. M. Narayanaswami Pillai.
22. " N. Siva Raj.
23. " M. V. Gangadhara Siva.

4-30  
p.m.

[28th March 1928]

*Ayes—cont.*

24. Rao Sahib L. C. Guruswami.
25. Mr. V. I. Muniswami Pillai.
26. " W. P. A. Soundara Pandia Nadar.
27. " S. Arpudawami Udayar.
28. " K. Ramachandra Padayachi.
29. " G. R. Premayya.
30. Swami A. S. Sahajanandam.
31. Rao Sahib N. Srinivasan.
32. Mr. V. Ramjee Rao.

33. The Zamindar of Gollapalli.
34. The Zamindar of Seithur.
35. The Raja of Ramnad.
36. Muhammad Khadir Mohidin Sahib Bahadur.
37. Mr. T. K. Chidambaranatha Mudaliyar.
38. The Raja of Panagal.
39. Rao Bahadur Sir A. P. Patro.
40. Diwan Bahadur M. Krishnan Nayar.

*Noes.*

1. Mr. Sami Venkatachalam Chetti.
2. " J. A. Saldanha.
3. " S. Sathyamurti.
4. " P. Anjaneyulu.
5. " C. S. Govindaraja Mudaliyar.
6. " G. Hariaravottama Rao.
7. " C. N. Mothuranga Mudaliyar.
8. Abdul Hamid Khan Bahadur.

9. Mr. K. V. R. Swami.
10. Mohammad Meera Ravuttar.
11. Mr. D. Narayana Raju.
12. Dr. B. S. Mallayya.
13. Mr. C. Ramasomayajulu.
14. Bishbeer Ahmad Sayeed Sahib Bahadur.
15. Mr. P. Daktavatsulu Nayudu.
16. " K. Kofi Reddi.

*Ayes 40.**Noes 16.*

The motion was carried and the grant was made.

**DEMAND XII—GENERAL ADMINISTRATION—MINISTERS AND CIVIL SECRETARIATS—TRANSFERRED.**

\* The hon. Dr. P. SUBBARAYAN :—"On the recommendation of His Excellency the Governor I move

*'that the Government be granted a sum not exceeding Rs. 3,900 under Demand XII—General Administration—Ministers and Civil Secretariats—Transferred' for providing additional temporary establishment in the office of the Registrar General of Panchayats.*

"I do not think I need add anything to what has been said in the explanatory memorandum placed before the hon. Members of this House."

Mr. K. V. R. SWAMI :—"I move—

*'that the allotment of Re. 3,900 for additional temporary establishment for the office of the Registrar-General of Panchayats be reduced by Rs. 100.'*

"Mr. President, Sir, the hon. Minister in charge did not choose to say a word why this amount is required. He cryptically said, 'If you want you had better read the explanation; I am aware of my strength in the House and so I am not going to give any further information.' It comes to that. So far as the subject itself is concerned the Registrar-General of Panchayats and Inspector of Municipal Councils has got a department which costs this House about Rs. 68,000 a year. In this note it is stated that at present it has got twelve clerks employed in the department. Now he wants the department to ultimately cost us Rs. 4,000 more than what it would otherwise cost. He has not shown how the department working under him is not sufficient for the purpose. He has simply stated that the establishment is not enough. He has not shown by any facts and figures that the establishment is not sufficient. Of course, everybody would like to have more men under him. It is usual for the heads of departments to always ask for more men so that they may feel easy in the working of the department or they may have the satisfaction of so many men working under them. After all, the panchayat business is not very difficult. They have not got much to do. They simply keep the registers and give information to the district and taluk boards. The district boards are engaging special men and give special

28th March 1928]

[Mr. K. V. R. Swami]

training with a view to help the panchayats. In West Godavari it is so, and I do not believe that the Raja of Ramnad is doing nothing. The district boards are now employing special men for rural reconstruction. They are giving special training to them to look after panchayats, to form panchayats, and keep registers properly. Thus the work of the Registrar-General of Panchayats would be lessened gradually and there will be no need to develop the source of expenditure also. The only thing that this Government is doing, according to me, or capable of doing is to develop the sources of expenditure and the resources of revenue. The cryptical way in which the Chief Minister treated us shows that the Government is resolved to have it and they feel confident that in any measure of expenditure he would be supported on account of the present peculiar situation of the House. And so the Government will go on and they do not feel that it is their duty to look into the matter more carefully and to try to satisfy this House by giving sufficient information. A statement is made that more men are required. How more men are required the Chief Minister does not say and he can be never expected to know unless he looks into the notes. The notes prepared by the Secretary will always contain some explanation. He must go into the whole matter without leaving it to the Under-Secretary or the Registrar-General who prepares the note. Now, he has got to read those notes. The proper way of doing it is to go into the whole matter carefully and say how the extra expenditure is required. Of course they have the money. Whenever it is required for the people and whenever useful purposes are suggested by the hon. Members of this House they always say they have no money. They have money only for the development of departments. In the circumstances, I would ask hon. Members to oppose this demand which means less expenditure for other useful purposes. We are not given sufficient explanation why this money is wanted. The explanation given is not at all satisfactory. We must vote against it so that the Chief Minister may come hereafter with better explanations to satisfy the House. Now it is quite the other way."

\* The hon. Dr. P. SUBBARAYAN :—"Mr. President, I am sorry my hon. Friend for East Godavari did not even take the trouble to look into the agenda paper and I thought the expert parliamentarian that he is he would have taken the trouble to look into the facts of the case before he took it into his head to pour the vials of his wrath on my head. The Registrar-General has been wanting a temporary establishment for a long time and we have been pointing out that these panchayats should be taken care of by the district boards themselves. Till the boards are organized in such a manner as to have an executive officer it will not be possible to decentralize the staff which is necessary for carrying on the work of these panchayats. The panchayats have increased now to 2,540 and I am sure the hon. Member will understand the amount of work it involves in the Registrar-General's office if he has to carry on the office satisfactorily to all the panchayats concerned. That is the only reason for the increase of establishment and this is only on a temporary basis. So I think my hon. Friend has wasted his remarks because he little thought, I think, that this establishment is on a temporary basis. This is only on a temporary basis till we are able to get the panchayats work under the district boards concerned."

\* Mr G. HARISARVOTTAMA RAO :—"I support the amendment of my hon. Friend for one reason more than another. That is this The Government has treated the panchayat business with step-motherly affection. They have not



[Mr. G. Harisarvottama Rao]

[28th March 1928]

permitted the panchayat movement to grow. They have put every obstacle to this movement. If we look at the last administration report we will find the Registrar-General of Panchayats saying 'Panchayats have since then generally avoided applying for power under section 19 from the Government'. It is because Government is very anxious to keep the power for itself. Panchayats are not given any irrigation powers; forests are not put under their control. For years past it is only one panchayat that has been allowed to manage its own forests. With regard to the organizers no provision has been made for their travelling allowances and they have to do the whole work in an honorary manner. I admit there has been an increase in the number of panchayats and I admit that the people are ready to take up work and do it for themselves. But it must be conceded on behalf of the Government—the reports themselves admit it—that this department has been treated with a step-motherly affection. To-day the Government come forward and say that they are employing temporary hands and this temporary establishment is required to discharge the additional duties imposed upon the department by the growth in the number of panchayats. This is to my mind almost farcical. You starve us and you come and say, 'I want to give you just a dose of orange juice after starvation.' I would rather have the man die instead of have him fed, after starving him intentionally, with a spoonful of orange juice. Several reports of the Registrar-General of Panchayats make it a complaint that powers are not given to the panchayats for any effective purpose.

4-45  
P.m.

"The porambokes are not theirs. The forests are not theirs. Everything that affects the powers of the Government is kept intact in the hands of the departments themselves. The panchayats are a farce and for this farce that there should be a demand for a temporary establishment is a matter which I am not able to understand. If the hon. Minister had examined the whole question carefully and had come forward boldly and courageously for the necessary amount for pushing on and making headway with the scheme of panchayat Government and established in this country of ours, panchayats on a powerful basis, I could have understood it. Now it is merely step-motherly affection. It is crocodile tears which the hon. Minister is shedding. He has no power and capacity to force the hands of the Government and to help this movement that is calculated to establish once again the village as the centre of life in this country. A great deal more money is required than what is being asked for. If pretences have to satisfy us instead of the truth of development, it is possible for us to pass a demand like this. I wish that the hon. Minister in charge of this department withdrew this motion immediately and came up before the House courageously for strengthening the panchayats in all possible ways and ask for a very much larger grant for that purpose, for very much better status to the panchayats and for very much better legislation on behalf of panchayats. Then this House may view the matter with greater love and interest. But as long as the panchayat is a farce and an eyewash to tell the people that they have something of panchayat Government in the country, and as long as the panchayats are disturbed by so many other powers operating in the same area, it is a matter on which the Government cannot congratulate themselves. I hope that better counsels will prevail with the hon. the Minister and that he will withdraw this motion at present and come forward at another time for a larger amount with greater courage in himself and a ready resignation in his pocket if he wants to carry his will."

28th March 1928]

\* **Mr. C. RAMASOMAYAJULU** :—"Mr. President, Sir, so that I may not be charged with the offence of not reading the explanatory note, I refer to the explanatory note given by the hon. the Chief Minister. I find, Sir, that the circumstances which seem to have necessitated this request for grant were in existence even on 1st October 1927. If hon. Members refer to the last two or three sentences they cannot come to any other conclusion than that stated above. 'The number of panchayats has increased from 1,881 on the 15th March 1927 to 2,450 on 1st October 1927. The Registrar-General's staff needs to be further added to in consequence. It is proposed to sanction temporarily the following additions to his staff . . . ' Was this necessity felt only after the budget estimates were prepared? I would like to know whether the Registrar-General made this request to the hon. the Chief Minister for entertaining this additional establishment. The matter was known to the hon. Minister much earlier than March of this year. I fail to understand why the Government should come forward for this grant at this hour of the day after the particular grant in the course of the general budget discussion has been discussed unless it be that by this method the hon. the Chief Minister wants to have easy work. The explanatory note says 'in consequence thereof it is proposed to sanction the following temporary establishment :

One manager on Rs. 125, three clerks on Rs. 55 each, one clerk on Rs. 40, and one muchi on Rs. 23.'

"I fail to see the necessity for an establishment on such a high scale for panchayats. Panchayats, we all know, do work of a very light and not heavy character and to have such a costly establishment appears to me to be out of place. I think that establishment is paid more than what is necessary. I do not see the urgency of the matter also. The House naturally feels that all these things are not plain dealing. Therefore I oppose this grant."

\* **The hon. the PRESIDENT** :—"The question is to reduce the allotment of Rs. 3,900 for additional temporary establishment for the office of the Registrar-General of Panchayats by Rs. 100."

The motion was put to the House and lost.

\* **The hon. the PRESIDENT** :—"The Zamindar of Gollapalli has given notice of a cut motion to recommend to Government to exclude the temple of Kottappakonda in Guntur district from the purview of the Hindu Religious Endowments Act. I am at a loss to understand how this matter is relevant to the demand."

\* **The ZAMINDAR OF GOLLAPALLI** :—"The same hon. Minister is in charge of the subject."

\* **The hon. the PRESIDENT** :—"That cannot be a ground for moving the motion. (Mr. G. Harisavottama Rao rose to speak.) I am prepared to hear Deputy Leaders and Leaders. The motion of the hon. Member (Zamindar of Gollapalli) is out of order."

"Mr. Saldanha has given notice of a motion to discuss the immediate necessity of amending the Panchayats Court Act. I think that that motion also is out of order. Mr. Muniswami Pillai wants to discuss by his motion that the working of the panchayats is not satisfactory to the depressed classes. I think that that matter cannot be discussed on this demand."

[28th March 1928]

\* Mr. S. SATYAMURTI :—“ Mr. President, Sir, we heard with regard to earlier demands that the Finance Committee wanted further details or that the cyclone happened very recently and that the Collector could not and did not send the report. But look at this, the way in which the so-called further demands are being used by the Executive Government. This is the explanatory note : ‘ The number of panchayats has increased from 1,831 on the 15th March 1927 to 2,450 on 1st October 1927. The Registrar-General’s staff needs to be further added to in consequence.’ Therefore the cause of action with regard to this further demand arose at the latest on the 1st October 1927. There were 30 days from that date to 31st October, the last date for the submission of the required demands for grants by the various spending departments to the Finance Department, and yet they omitted to do anything. A whole month elapsed before the time usually prescribed according to the rules and practice of our Government, and all the time nothing is done by the Registrar-General of Panchayats or by the hon. Minister concerned for bringing this demand before the Finance Department and get it incorporated in the budget. The explanatory note says : ‘ it is proposed to sanction temporarily the following additional establishment : 1 Manager, 3 clerks, 1 clerk and 1 muchi’. Sir, even according to the restricted meaning you were pleased to give to the rule there must be some new matter since the presentation of the budget. I submit that this demand is, as clear a case as you can get, where nothing has arisen since the preparation of the budget to the House. How is this a further demand? Sir, it contemplates no new matter at all. I therefore submit that the House should be jealous of its rights and privileges and the Finance Department instead of imagining itself as a mere kind of annex to the Executive Government merely carrying out their orders and sending the demands over here, must keep the financial conscience of this House. I think we must put down our foot very firmly upon these so-called further demands, which have no manner of justification to be called so, from any point of view. I put it to you, Sir, and to this House whether any arguments can be advanced or any reasonable grounds put forth to suggest that there is a new matter or a new service contemplated. As early as 1st October 1927 the Registrar-General of Panchayats wanted to increase his staff. After the budget was presented to this House the Registrar-General of Panchayats—an active gentleman whom I know very well—must have worried and taken the hon. Minister’s life out of him to give the Registrar-General the necessary staff. One fine morning, the hon. Minister makes up his mind to bring forward this further demand for a service which was contemplated as early as 1st October 1927. I know, Sir, that the House is impatient. I know I am not likely to rouse the financial conscience of the House at once. But it should be borne in mind that to-day we cannot serve our country as much by our successes as by our failures. I hope that the financial conscience of this House will be roused, if not to-day, at least sometime later. In view of the impropriety of bringing forward hastily such further demands, without any justification which will be accepted either here or in the House of Commons I venture to oppose the motion and ask all those friends who are not anxious to see this King’s Government is carried on, to see the prestige of this House kept up, and to vote against this motion.”

\* The hon. Dr. P. SUBBARAYAN :—“ Sir, I am very much amused at the remarks made by the hon. Member for the University. I did not know that he would waste the eloquence that he possesses in this manner. If he had



28th March 1928]

[Dr. P. Subbarayan]

thought of it I expect he would have been better instructed than he had been recently especially in the matter of the obstructive tactics he has been adopting the whole of this morning. His attempt seems to be to see that these demands are not proceeded with. At every stage my hon. Friend has spent his eloquence which might have been better used elsewhere in order to see that the time of the House is wasted."

Mr. S. SATYAMURTI :—" On a matter of personal explanation. I resent very strongly . . . "

\* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" The hon. Minister has not yielded. I shall give an opportunity to the hon. Member after the hon. Minister has finished."

\* The hon. Dr. P. SUBBARAYAN :—" I am glad that my hon. Friend resents. I hope the resentment will bear fruit. (A voice :—Impertinent.) There is no question of impertinence. The hon. Member for the University should be the last person to complain. I am glad that the hon. Member is realizing that he will be able to better use his time."

" Coming now to the question why this demand was not put in the budget I may say that this question was under the consideration of my ex-colleague the Minister for Development who was then in charge of panchayats. He was considering whether the staff was necessary at all. He did not see there was much necessity for the staff. But after a great deal of consideration, as I said before, we felt that if the panchayats were to function properly the staff of the Registrar-General of Panchayats ought to be strengthened for the present till we determine how best the panchayats could be looked into by the local bodies concerned. We have therefore proposed to bring forward this demand before the House."

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" The question is that 'the Government be granted a sum not exceeding Rs. 3,900 under Demand XII—General Administration—Ministers and Civil Secretariats—Transferred.' "

The motion was put to the House and carried and the grant was made.

\* Mr. SAMI VENKATACHALAM CHETTI :—" I beg to move that the consideration of the agenda be postponed to 11 o'clock to-morrow. Most of us had no intimation that the House will sit longer than usual. We have got prior engagements, and it is impossible for us to avoid them and sit here longer. I would therefore beg that this resolution be accepted by the House."

Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR :—" I second it."

\* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" The question is that the consideration of the agenda be postponed to 11 o'clock to-morrow."

\* The hon. Dr. P. SUBBARAYAN :—" Mr. President, I beg to oppose the motion of the Leader of the Opposition, because I am sure that if we had to work in a smooth fashion, the Leader of the Opposition would have seen to it that these obstructive tactics which have been in play the whole day were not followed. Because of these tactics we have not been able to have even half of the number of demands finished till now and the days allotted for these demands are only two. So I should say that we sit till at least 6 o'clock this evening."

\* Mr. S. SATYAMURTI :—" My hon. Friend has given a lecture to my Friend the Leader of the Opposition now, and myself earlier, that we ought

[Mr. S. Satyamurti]

[28th March 1928]

to learn from him how to fulfil the duties of the Opposition, that we are here to co-operate with my hon. Friend and see that these demands are put through expeditiously and smoothly and that we do not make speeches but shout 'Aye, Aye' for every demand put. My hon. Friend may be an expert in ministry-forming and ministry-running, but he is not an expert in the art of Opposition. Though he has been in the Opposition once, he has not yet learnt the duties of the Opposition, and I may suggest to him that he may as well reserve to himself his remarks and not lecture to us, people who know how to conduct the Opposition and what we should do. The question of obstructive tactics does not arise. It is the duty of the Opposition to oppose; it is not the duty of the Opposition to co-operate with the Government. It may suit some people there (on the other benches) to do that. But here we are, in the best House of Commons parliamentary traditions, to oppose this Government, and to oppose every grant brought forward. In spite of the threats of the Chief Minister, we are not going to be frightened or deterred from following any tactics which we consider proper. With regard to the two days allotted, my respectful complaint to you, Sir, and through you, to the Government, is that if they wanted to introduce 38 demands and if they wanted us to consider so many demands before the responsible advisers of His Excellency advised him to allot only two days, I think, Sir, under these very parliamentary traditions of which my hon. Friend so glibly talks, the leaders on the Opposition should have been consulted. It is due to us that the Government, before they advised His Excellency to give only two days, must have placed their cards on the table, and told us, 'We have got as many as 38 items, and it may require some time to dispose of, how many days do you want?' Then we would not have obstructed and we would have told them, 'These are the demands; if you cannot grant more than two days, pick out those demands which are most urgent and put them before us.' You do nothing of the kind, but simply ignore the Opposition. That is the kind of parliamentary tradition which the Chief Minister is building up—to ignore the Opposition, to get only two days behind the back of the Opposition for discussing 26 or 33 demands. In these circumstances, Mr. President—I myself do not yet know whether you are going to be pleased to order that the House should sit beyond 5 o'clock which is the ordinary hour for rising—I have no official information in the matter."

\* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—"Some other information the hon. Member has got, if he has not official information."

\* Mr. S. SATYAMURTI :—"I have got some other kind of vague notion that the President may be willing, if the House agrees, to sit beyond 5. I want you therefore to consider that the convenience of that section of the House which has got the duty, although in small numbers, of looking with lynx eyes into these demands must be consulted."

"My hon. Friend (Mr. Sami Venkatachalam Chettiyar) said that we have got other engagements. It is not a rhetorical point. This evening we have got a meeting of our party; to-morrow we have got the meeting of the Municipal Council and also of the Senate, engagements fixed up long ago, from which several members elected by this House cannot be absent. It seems to me therefore, having omitted to consult our convenience, now to insist on these demands being carried on beyond 5 or 6 p.m. is merely to deprive the Opposition of its inherent right to sit here and oppose these

28th March 1928]

[Mr. S. Satyamurti]

demands. I therefore appeal to the House to accept the adjournment and not to put us to the painful necessity of having to say to our electorates that by a vote of a tyrannical majority of the House, we were deprived of our right to go on offering such help and such criticism as we feel called upon to offer in respect of the discussion of these demands. The majority has got the giant's strength, and the minority can be killed in the House by the majority saying 'We will move closures, we will go on obstructing and we won't allow adjournments to be made nor allow you to discuss.' Again, in the name of the House of Commons traditions, it is the duty of all majorities not to use their giant's strength like a giant. I know you can ask the House to sit up till 10 o'clock even, to dispose of the demands. But such a thing as elections are coming on, and the votes for the adjournment will be analysed--of course I am not talking of the official members--and the electorate will then question the attitude of the members who did not agree to the adjournment. My friends who oppose this motion, let them remember they will have to face their electorates. Two of the members on the opposite bench were here some days ago and they may again be here; and they will do well to ask themselves, whether they would be justified in the action they propose to take. We claim as members elected to the House, with a full sense of responsibility, that this adjournment should not be defeated by the sheer weight of majority."

\* The hon. the PRESIDENT:—"I think a few words are necessary before I put this motion to the vote of the House. It has always been the practice of this House to allot only one day for further demands and the House used to sit very late in the evening and dispose of all the demands. This year, two days were allotted for further demands; and according to the Standing Orders and according to the arrangement already made regarding the voting of the budget demands, 27th having already been allotted as a non-official day, only two days were available, viz., 28th and 29th, for the further demands. My only business is to go according to the Standing Orders. S.O. No. 66-A is clear on this point. The agenda contains 38 items and I have no course open to me except to sit in the chair and put demand after demand until they are exhausted or until a motion to postpone them to the next day is carried by the House. With these words, I now put the motion to the vote of the House."

The question is that the consideration of the further demands be postponed till 11 o'clock to-morrow.

The question was put and declared lost.

Mr. Satyamurti demanded a poll, and the House divided as follows:—

*Ayes.*

1. Mr. J. A. Saldanha.
2. " Sani Venkatachalam Chetti.
3. " S. Satyamurti.
4. " C. V. Venkataramana Ayyangar.
5. " P. Anjaneyulu.
6. " C. S. Govindaraja Mudaliyar.
7. " G. Harisarvottama Rao.
8. " C. N. Muthuranga Mudaliyar.
9. " Abdul Hamid Khan Sahib.
10. " K. V. R. Swami.
11. " D. Narayana Raju.

12. Dr. B. S. Mallayya.
13. Mr. M. Narayana Rao.
14. " C. Ramasomayajulu.
15. Basheer Ahmad Sayeed Sahib Bahadur.
16. Mr. P. Bakthavatsulu Nayudu.
17. " K. Koti Reddi.
18. Diwan Bahadur R. N. Arogyaswami Mudaliyar.
19. The Raja of Ramnad.
20. The Zamindar of Gollapalli.
21. Mr. B. Ramachandra Reddi.



[28th March 1928]

## Noes.

- |                                                 |                                      |
|-------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| 1. The hon. Sir Norman Marjoribanks.            | 16. Mr. R. Foulkes.                  |
| 2. " Khan Bahadur Muhammad Usman Sahib Bahadur. | 17. " C. D. Appavu Chettiyar.        |
| 3. " Mr. T. E. Moir.                            | 18. " A. B. Shetty.                  |
| 4. " " A. Y. G. Campbell.                       | 19. " J. Bheemayya.                  |
| 5. " " M. R. Seturatnam Ayyar.                  | 20. Mahmad Schammad Sabib Bahadur.   |
| 6. " " S. Muthiah Mudaliyar.                    | 21. Subadar-Major Nanjappa Bahadur.  |
| 7. " " Dr. P. Subbarayan.                       | 22. Mr. T. M. Narayanaswami Pillai.  |
| 8. Rao Bahadur C. V. Ananthakrishna Ayyar.      | 23. " N. Siva Raj.                   |
| 9. Mr. F. B. Evans.                             | 24. " M. V. Gangadhara Siva.         |
| 10. " H. A. Watson.                             | 25. Rao Sahib L. C. Guruswami.       |
| 11. " G. T. Boag.                               | 26. Mr. V. I. Maniswami Pillai.      |
| 12. " A. McG. C. Tampoe.                        | 27. " W. P. A. Soundarapandia Nadar. |
| 13. " S. H. Slater.                             | 28. " S. Venkiah.                    |
| 14. " C. B. Cotterell.                          | 29. " M. A. Manikkavelu Nayakar.     |
| 15. " P. J. Gnanavaram Pillai.                  | 30. Swami A. S. Sahajanandam.        |
|                                                 | 31. Rao Sahib R. Srinivasan.         |

Ayes 21. Noes 31.

The motion was lost.

\* Mr. SAMI VENKATACHALAM CHETTI :—" Mr. President, Sir, I very much regret the decision which the House has arrived at on this adjournment motion."

\* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" People must take the decisions cheerfully."

Mr. SAMI VENKATACHALAM CHETTI :—" We would have certainly taken the decision cheerfully had it been come to in a sportsmanlike manner. We mentioned our difficulties not only to the Leader of the House but also to the Ministers but they were not convinced. We never intended when we asked for adjournment that the demands should be obstructed, but we only put it on the ground of convenience. We had made already other prior engagements and therefore we made the request to the Leader of the House and the Ministers. We see that they want to use their voting strength, not in a sportsmanlike manner. We have therefore the only option of keeping our engagements elsewhere and allowing the Government to have its own way."

After this, the Leader of the Opposition walked out, followed by the Swarajists.

## DEMAND XIV—JAILS.

\* The hon. Mr. A. Y. G. CAMPBELL :—" Sir, on the recommendation of His Excellency the Governor, I beg to move

*'that the Government be granted a sum not exceeding Rs. 6,600 under XIV—Jails.'*

" Sir, this is intended to provide for a grant to the Madras Society for the Protection of Children to repair certain buildings. The elementary school maintained by this Society has been certified by the Government as a certified school for destitute boys. It has been recently reported to the Government that the school building is in urgent need of repairs, and an estimate prepared by the Executive Engineer for Rs. 8,600 was also forwarded. The Committee of the Society has represented that they have only Rs. 2,000 at their disposal. We therefore propose that the Government should find the remaining sum of Rs. 6,600."

28th March 1928]

The demand was put and carried and the grant was made.

Mr. J. A. SALDANHA :—" May I rise to a point of order? There is no quorum in the House."

(At this stage, Mr. Krishnan Nayar entered and took his seat.)

\* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" Now there is a quorum." (Loud laughter.)

\* The hon. Mr. A. Y. G. CAMPBELL :—" Mr. President, on the recommendation of His Excellency the Governor, I move

*' that the Government be granted a sum not exceeding Rs. 1,200 under XIV—Jails for the appointment of six temporary petty officers in the Borstal School, Tanjore.'*

"The number of inmates in the school has very much increased in the last six months and the number of petty officers has also to be increased, to cope with the work. Hence the necessity for this demand."

The demand was put and carried and the grant was made.

DEMAND XIX—EDUCATION (TRANSFERRED).

\* The hon. Dr. P. SUBBARAYAN :—" Mr. President, on the recommendation of His Excellency the Governor, I move 5-15  
p.m.

*' that Government be granted a sum not exceeding Rs. 15,000 under Demand XIX—Education (Transferred).'*

"This is made as a grant to the University of Madras for their Inspection Commission. The University asked the Government that they should provide money for the carrying on of this Commission and the Government have now allotted this sum for the purposes of this Commission."

\* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" The question is that Government be granted a sum not exceeding Rs. 15,000 under Demand XIX—Education (Transferred). I take that the House is ready for a vote on this."

The demand was put to the House and adopted and the grant was made.

\* The hon. Dr. P. SUBBARAYAN :—" Mr. President, on the recommendation of His Excellency the Governor, I move

*' that Government be granted a sum not exceeding Rs. 58,500 under Demand XIX—Education (Transferred).'*

"This is made for the expansion of training facilities of women teachers, because there has been a great demand for women teachers in this province and as I have said time and again, it is necessary to have trained teachers in the schools. That is the reason for the establishment of five schools, three of them in the Andhra country."

\* Mr. V. I. MUNISWAMI PILLAI :—" Mr. President, the object of my motion, viz.,

*' to reduce the allotment of Rs. 58,500 for the training of women teachers by Rs. 100.'*

is to request Government to recruit at least 10 per cent of women teachers from the depressed classes and give increased stipends to . . ."

[28th March 1928]

\* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—"I do not think a general question of the recruitment of women teachers from the depressed classes can be raised under this demand. It is out of order."

\* Mr. V. I. MUNISWAMI PILLAI :—"I obey your ruling, Sir."

\* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—"The question is that Government be granted a sum not exceeding Rs. 58,500 under Grant XIX--Education (Transferred)."

The demand was put to the House and carried and the grant was made.

\* The hon. Dr. P. SUBBARAYAN :—"Mr. President, Sir, on the recommendation of His Excellency the Governor, I move

*'that Government be granted a sum not exceeding Rs. 2,200 under Demand XIX--Education (Transferred).'*

"This is for the provision of fund to the Andhra University for helping Dr. A. L. Narayanan who is carrying on some work in physical research and as the University asked for this amount only now, we have had to make this further demand."

The demand was put to the House and carried and the grant was made.

\* The hon. Dr. P. SUBBARAYAN :—"Mr. President, on the recommendation of His Excellency the Governor, I move

*'that Government be granted a sum not exceeding Rs. 2,000 under Demand XIX--Education (Transferred).'*

"This is wanted for providing further expenditure on the Tamil University Committee who have not as yet finished their labours, and their labours will only come to an end in April 1928. This amount is required to carry on their work till it is finished."

The demand was put to the House and carried and the grant was made.

#### DEMAND XX—MEDICAL.

\* The hon. Mr. S. MUTHIAH MUDALIYAR :—"I move

*'that on the recommendation of His Excellency the Governor the Government be granted a sum not exceeding Rs. 4,300 under Demand XX—Medical.'*

"This is for the appointment of a whole-time professor of Bacteriology in the Madras Medical College. A note on this has been circulated to hon. Members and the Surgeon-General feels the necessity for the establishment of the Chair. I therefore move that the grant be made."

The demand was put to the House and carried and the grant was made.

\* The hon. Mr. S. MUTHIAH MUDALIYAR :—"On the recommendation of His Excellency the Governor, I move

*'that Government be granted a sum not exceeding Rs. 3,000 under Demand XX—Medical.'*



28th March 1928]

[Mr. S. Muthiah Mudaliyar]

“This provides for the employment of a second assistant to the Professor of Hygiene in the Madras Medical College. The number of students in both the classes of the District Health Officers and the Inspectors has very much increased and the need is very much felt for a second assistant to the Professor of Hygiene.”

\* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—“Mr. V. I. Muniswami Pillai wants to move the following motion :—

*‘To reduce the allotment of Rs. 3,000 for the employment of a second assistant to the Professor of Hygiene in the Madras Medical College by Rs. 100 (to elicit information whether great inconvenience is felt by sanitary inspectors by being forced to undergo quinquennial training).’*

“I don’t think it is in order as the demand relates only to the appointment of a second assistant to the Professor of Hygiene.”

MR. V. I. MUNISWAMI PILLAI :—“I obey your ruling, Sir.”

The demand was put to the House and carried and the grant was made.

\* The hon. MR. S. MUTHIAH MUDALIYAR :—“On the recommendation of His Excellency the Governor, I move

*‘that Government be granted a sum not exceeding Rs. 3,200 under Demand XX—Medical.’*

“This provides for grants to local boards in the Nellore district for the repair of cyclone damages to medical buildings. This matter has been already dealt with at length by the hon. the Revenue Member and I do not think I shall dilate further on it. I therefore move for the grant.”

MR. B. RAMACHANDRA REDDI :—“Mr. President, Sir, I beg to move the following motion :—

*‘To reduce the allotment of Rs. 3,200 for grants to local boards in the Nellore district by Rs. 100.’*

“This is to point out the inadequacy of the grants proposed.

“Sir, though I feel very weak for opposition at this stage, nevertheless, I put before this House my case for the judicious consideration of the Government in regard to the cyclone damage grants proposed to be given to the Nellore district. I do not like to narrate the havoc caused by the cyclone on 1st November 1927, because the House as well as the Government are quite aware of the several difficulties and the several losses that the district has been subjected to as a result of this terrible cyclone. Many of the buildings belonging to the local boards, not to speak of the Government buildings, have been completely damaged. It is no exaggeration to say that most of the buildings are still under desolation. Many buildings have not even been touched at all and no repair work has been taken up because they say that funds are not available. The District Board of Nellore has submitted estimates to the Government to the extent of Rs. 1,18,000 under several heads and I am very much surprised and disappointed to find in the budget today that only a small sum of Rs. 3,200 has been proposed to be given to the local boards in Nellore for the repair of medical buildings. This is a

[Mr. B. Ramachandra Reddi]

[28th March 1928]

deplorable state of things which the Government should at least now think of remedying. The district is already poor and it is made poorer still by the cyclone of 1927. The famine conditions that prevailed before 1927 had very bad effects and the cyclone came on the wake of it and made the condition of the people still worse. The condition with regard to local boards is the same. They are in a very poverty-stricken condition and are not able to maintain their own roads and buildings and other services. The District Board is closing with a minus balance and the taluk boards and union boards are not in a position to finance the repair work of the several buildings belonging to them. It is also no exaggeration to say that in several unions till now no lights have been put up and they are expecting Government grant to help them. In these conditions, it will be injudicious and iniquitous that Government should think of giving only half grants to certain works. So far the Government thought of giving only Rs. 53,000 for all the taluk boards in consideration of the several estimates that have been submitted to Government. In the explanatory note that has been placed on the table, it is found that the Government have made the discovery that some of the local boards are well off and that they can rebuild their buildings and maintain their own services, but I must say that it is an incorrect statement. In the explanatory note, it is stated as follows '(c) estimates for certain works in the Kavali Taluk Board area, for which the Collector has not recommended any grant; (d) estimates for works in the areas under the Nellore, Gudur, and Venkatagiri Taluk Boards for which it is not proposed to make any grants owing to the fact that the financial position of these boards is satisfactory.' I should say that this is very incorrect. I do not know who gave the information. I will only ask Government to tell me who it is that has submitted the information to Government. I hope the Government ought to have considered the position of these taluk boards properly before they came up with these proposals for grant. At this stage it is not possible for the local boards to levy any extra tax because this will be purely a non-recurring expenditure and that it will be unwise to impose extra taxation for any non-recurring expenditure. I have already stated how people have been reduced to poverty and no extra taxation can be thought of at this stage. In these circumstances it is highly necessary that Government should think of increasing the grant. The amount of Rs. 53,000 proposed to be given to the local boards is very very inadequate and that it will be necessary to increase the amount to that asked for by the district board. They have carefully estimated for the works that they have to do and I am also reliably informed that the District Collector has taken care to remove such of the works from the estimates that were not necessary.

5-30  
p.m.

"I cannot but say that in certain cases works that were not to be found before the cyclone have also been estimated for after the cyclone came in and I am told that the District Collector has made the necessary reductions in the estimates and has submitted them to the Government. But I cannot for a moment think that he would have given this deplorable and sorrowful tale and that he would have, for a moment, recommended to the Government that the local board should be given only Rs 55,000 when they asked for Rupees 1,80,000. With these remarks, Sir, I submit to the Government that the district has not been properly treated this year, and especially after the cyclone that wrought a good deal of havoc the question should be reconsidered by the Government and further grants should be sanctioned."

28th March 1928]

\* The hon. Mr. S. MUTHIAH MUDALIYAR :—" Sir, I have been carefully listening to the speech of the hon. Member from Nellore and I quite sympathize with him and a good deal of damage has been done. I have to remind him, however, of the fact that a grant has already been made last year to the extent of about Rs. 10,000 to the Nellore district and grants now provided in these further demands to the Nellore municipality, the district and local boards come to about Rs. 60,000 in all. If still there be more grants necessary,—and I am sure that the hon. Member from Nellore will be able to convince the Government that more will be needed—of course, Government will be prepared to consider and make further grants. Although this demand itself is only for a sum of Rs. 3,200, the hon. Member will see that demands at items 17, 18, 21, 22, 25 and 26 are all for the Nellore district and come in all to about Rs. 60,000. With these few words, Sir, I will request the hon. Member to withdraw his motion."

\* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" Does the hon. Member press his motion ? "

Mr. B. RAMACHANDRA REDDI :—" No, Sir."

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

\* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" I now put the demand to the vote of the House. The question is that Government be granted a sum not exceeding Rs. 3,200 under Demand XX—Medical."

The demand was put to the House and adopted and the grant was made.

\* The hon. Mr. S. MUTHIAH MUDALIYAR :—" Sir, on the recommendation of His Excellency the Governor, I beg to move

*' for a grant not exceeding Rs. 1,400 under Demand XX—Medical.'*

" Damages have been done to the Municipal Medical buildings also. This demand is made to repair a portion of the damages done and the demand is for Rs. 1,400."

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" The question is that Government be granted a sum not exceeding Rs. 1,400 under Demand XX—Medical. (After a pause) I take it that the House is ready for a vote on the question."

The demand was put to the House and carried and the grant was made.

#### DEMAND XXI—PUBLIC HEALTH AND VITAL STATISTICS.

\* The hon. Mr. S. MUTHIAH MUDALIYAR :—" Sir, on the recommendation of His Excellency the Governor, I move

*' that Government be granted a sum not exceeding Rs. 30,200, Demand XXI—Public Health and Vital Statistics for carrying on propaganda connected with hookworm investigation and transfer of control of the Ankylostomiasis campaign to the Public Health Department.'*"

Diwan Bahadur M. KRISHNAN NAYAR :—" Kindly pronounce that word."

\* The hon. Mr. S. MUTHIAH MUDALIYAR :—" If my hon. Friend is not satisfied with my pronouncement, he will help me to pronounce it properly.

" This research, Sir, was carried on with the aid of contributions made by the Rockefeller institution and they now find that sufficient advance has been made in this province in regard to this work and they want to withdraw the support and leave the Government to run the campaign. I therefore move for a grant for this purpose."



[28th March 1928]

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—"The question is that Government be granted a sum not exceeding Rs. 30,200 under Demand XXI—Public Health and Vital Statistics."

\* Mr. S. ARPUDASWAMI UDAYAR :—"Mr. President, Sir, I move for the reduction of the allotment by Rs. 100 to discuss the urgency of the propaganda in the mufassal and rural parts.

"Sir, I know that some three or four years ago, an attempt was made to interest even Members of this Council in this work. I remember Dr. Kendrick himself delivered two lectures for the benefit of the Members of this Council and my impression is that many Members of this House take no interest whatever in this work. I do not know whether people even in the cities have been made aware of the beneficial effects or useful operations of this work. All honour to the Rockefeller Foundation for the incentive that it has given to a great humanitarian work. All honour to the men who have tried their best to carry out the wishes of that philanthropic body. It is somewhat discouraging to find that the work has not been sufficiently appreciated. However, they have the satisfaction of having done their duty and having at least impressed upon this Government the duty they owe to the people of this Presidency, that their health, especially in this particular respect, should be adequately taken care of. Now, Sir, it is a question of transferring this control to the Public Health department, and it is here that the importance of my suggestion comes in. I suggest that if the Public Health department is going to run it, it must not run it as a mere show. It must do useful work. Therefore, I think it must insist on some propaganda work.

"Sir, one of the causes of this disease,—I think many of the doctors here present will testify to it, for I am only a layman and I can speak only with that commonsense which laymen have—I say, Sir, one of the causes is surface pollution. What steps have been taken even in cities to eradicate this evil of surface pollution? Nothing has been done. Therefore, Sir, unless propaganda work is done and an impetus is given to the Public Health department to remove all these causes which operate to allow the disease to spread and to attack nearly 95 per cent, and I may even say 99 per cent of the people of the province, unless I repeat, Sir, this is done, there is no use spending Rs. 30,200. I therefore request the hon. the Minister to see that propaganda work is carried on and something really useful and tangible is done by the department."

\* The hon. Mr. S. MUTHIAH MUDALIYAR :—"Mr. President, Sir, I entirely agree with every remark of the hon. Member from Tanjore, Mr. Arpudaswami Udayar. I agree with him that sufficient propaganda has not been done, though a good deal of research has been made, and I quite agree with him in saying that even many hon. Members of this House do not know very much about the subject. But it will be one of the endeavours of the Government to publish the knowledge available in a readable form and in an easy style so that people may understand what the disease is and how to prevent it. Every remark of the hon. Member will be noted and steps taken to do what all may be useful to the people."

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

28th March 1928]

\* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" I now put the demand to the vote of the House. The question is that Government be granted a sum of Rs. 30,200 under Demand XXI—Public Health and Vital Statistics."

The demand was put to the House and carried and the grant was made.

\* The hon. Mr. S. MUTHIAH MUDALIYAR :—" Sir, on the recommendation of His Excellency the Governor, I beg to move

*'that Government be granted a sum not exceeding Rs. 4,500 for the investigation of the water-supply scheme for the Peddapuram Municipal Council.'*"

\* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" The question is that Government be granted a sum not exceeding Rs. 4,500 under Demand XXI—Public Health and Vital Statistics. (After a pause.) I take it that the House is ready for a vote on the question."

The demand was put to the House and carried and the grant was made.

\* The hon. Mr. S. MUTHIAH MUDALIYAR :—" Sir, on the recommendation of His Excellency the Governor, I beg to move

*'that Government be granted a sum not exceeding Rs. 400 under Demand XXI—Public Health and Vital Statistics for the repair of the damages done to the Conservancy tanks by the cyclone in the local boards of the Nellore district.'*"

\* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" The question is that Government be granted a sum not exceeding Rs. 400 under Demand XXI—Public Health and Vital Statistics. (After a pause.) I take it that the House is ready for a vote on the question."

The demand was put to the House and carried and the grant was made.

\* The hon. Mr. S. MUTHIAH MUDALIYAR :—" On the recommendation of His Excellency the Governor, I beg to move

*'that the Government be granted a sum not exceeding Rs. 1,700 under Demand XXI—Public Health and Vital Statistics for the repair of the damages done by the cyclone to the conservancy plant in the Nellore municipality.'*"

\* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" The question is that Government be granted a sum not exceeding Rs. 1,700 under Demand XXI—Public Health and Vital Statistics. (After a pause.) I take it that the House is ready for a vote on the question."

The demand was put to the House and carried and the grant was made.

#### DEMAND XXVI—INDUSTRIES.

\* The hon. Mr. M. R. SETURATNAM AYYAR :—" On the recommendation of His Excellency the Governor, I beg to move, Sir,

*'that the Government be granted a sum not exceeding Rs. 6,000 under Demand XXVI—Industries, for the purpose of erecting a deep well and a metal tower in the compound of the Industrial Engineering Workshop.'*

[Mr. M. R. Seturatnam Ayyar] [28th March 1928]

"Sir, all the engineering firms in the City of Madras are sending the different types of pumps which they are manufacturing in their shops at Madras to this workshop for test. The departmental pumps and privately owned pumps also come there for repairs and they have also to be similarly tested. They are now being tested in a small well inside the compound of the industrial workshop with a temporary wooden platform over it, which is unsafe and expensive. Therefore, it is proposed to have a deep well sunk with a raised masonry structure and a metal tower 50 feet high. Therefore, I move this demand."

\*The hon. the PRESIDENT:—"The question is that Government be granted a sum not exceeding Rs. 6,000 under Demand XXVI—Industries. (After a pause.) I take it that the House is ready for a vote on this question."

The demand was put to the House and carried and the grant was made.

#### DEMAND XXVIII—LABOUR INCLUDING FACTORIES.

\*The hon. Khan Bahadur MUHAMMAD USMAN SAHIB Bahadur:—"Sir, on the recommendation of His Excellency the Governor, I move

*'that the Government be granted a sum not exceeding Rs. 900 under Demand XXVIII—Labour including factories.'*

"This is to provide a remuneration to the honorary District Labour Officer at Malabar. Mr. P. V. Gopalan was appointed honorary District Labour Officer for Malabar in 1925 for a period of one year. His work there was commended by the Collector of Malabar and the late Sir George Paddison, the then Commissioner of Labour. Therefore, Sir, his term was extended for another year. He was again appointed for the third time and is to continue as the honorary District Labour Officer till about September of this year. In the meantime the Labour Commissioner proposed that he should be given an allowance of Rs. 15 and this has been provided in the budget. After this the Collector of Malabar wrote that owing to the increased work, Mr. P. V. Gopalan should be given an honorarium of Rs. 100 per month. For this purpose, Sir, I move this demand."

\*The RAJA OF RAMNAD:—"May I ask, Sir, for information as to whether Mr. Gopalan himself demanded this remuneration or whether the Government offered it and whether he is willing to accept it? I ask this, Sir, because honorary workers are not generally willing to accept these remunerations."

The hon. Khan Bahadur MUHAMMAD USMAN SAHIB Bahadur:—"He is willing to accept this."

\*The hon. the PRESIDENT:—"The question is that Government be granted a sum not exceeding Rs. 900 under Demand XXVIII—Labour."

\*Mr. V. I. MUNISWAMI PILLAI:—"Mr. President, Sir, I move to reduce the allotment by Rs. 100 which have given notice of. I base my appeal to the Government on two grounds, first on principle and secondly on the personae of the honorary labour officer. Speaking on the ground of principle, I may say that once a gentleman who has been taken as an honorary officer should not look to Government for any emoluments or remuneration. That is entirely a wrong principle. This class of people who come first as honorary officers and subsequently claim emoluments should not be encouraged



28th March 1928]

[Mr. V. I. Mudiswami Pillai]

and should be ruled out. We, some of the Members on this side representing the depressed classes, have been asking for honorary officers, chosen from the depressed classes and not from any other community, for many reasons. Even if members of the depressed classes are chosen as honorary officers, I submit they should not be given any emoluments.

"Passing on to the personale of the honorary officer, Sir, I am surprised to see that Government have come forward with a demand to give remuneration to a man of the present type.

"Sir, it is notorious in Malabar that the present honorary officer has no sympathy whatever towards the depressed classes. I challenge the hon. the Home Member or any responsible officer to send for at least half a dozen depressed class men from Malabar and find out the mentality of the Labour Officer. Sir, it is notorious that he has sunk no wells for the depressed classes, that he has not obtained or secured any lands for house-sites for them or for cultivation purposes. He encourages non-depressed class members as teachers in labour schools. Sir, had it not been for the peculiar sympathy extended by the former Collector of Malabar, Mr. Pate, schemes such as the Nayadi colony, the Perunthalamanna school and the hostel at Calicut would not have been accomplished facts to-day. Sir, replying to the general debate this year, the hon. the Home Member said that a question had been raised that better status should be given to the District Labour Officers. I may quote from his speech, Sir. He said: 'the present Commissioner of Labour has got a scheme for so doing and that scheme has been submitted to the Government and is under consideration'. He said again 'I may give this assurance that the scheme submitted by Mr. Slater will be fully considered by the Government'. From his speech, Sir, it is plain that he has been contemplating to have labour officers of a better type on a permanent basis, that is, chosen from the cadre of the Tahsildars or Deputy Collectors. I do not see the wisdom of asking for a grant at this stage, to pay remuneration to the honorary Labour Officer. Sir, in the month of January, the Fourth Malabar Adi-Dravida Conference was held at Calicut when a resolution was unanimously accepted, which I should like to place before this House, through you. The resolution was:

'Whereas the appointment of Rao Sahib P. V. Gopalan as the Honorary District Labour Officer for Malabar has, instead of doing any substantial good to the depressed classes, only retarded their progress in many directions, whereas most of his actions are decidedly against the interests of the Adi-Dravidas, whereas in the matter of appointments, he has obstinately and insultingly discarded the superior and preferential claims of Adi-Dravidas in several cases, whereas he has persistently and deliberately denied every information to the leaders of the Adi-Dravidas about the programme and residence of the Commissioner of Labour, Madras, during his first official visit to Malabar and thereby frustrated the Adi-Dravida deputation from meeting the Commissioner although the Commissioner had directed them to meet him, whereas the District Labour Officer is discharging his duties in a most arrogant, irresponsible and reprehensible manner, whereas by his unbecoming attitude the Labour Officer has become odious and repugnant to the leaders of the depressed classes in Malabar and whereas such actions of the District Labour Officer are utterly unworthy of the traditions, future promises and even the fundamental ideas of the Labour Department in this Presidency, this Conference most humbly and fervently requests the Madras Government to be pleased to remove him from office at once and appoint a more qualified, competent and resourceful person in his place.'

"Sir, copies of this resolution have already been forwarded to the hon. the Home Member and the Labour Commissioner, and the Labour Commissioner also had the courtesy of inviting me and going with me into the merits of these resolutions, and I pointed out to him that my impression of the Malabar honorary Labour Officer was that he was an unsympathetic officer towards the depressed classes. Sir, it was stated in the brief note given to us

5-45  
P.M.

[Mr. V. I. Muniswami Pillai] [28th March 1928]

in connexion with this demand that there was no work for the Labour Officer to find land and other things. I may say, Sir, that when I was in Cannanore, I had occasion to visit a place called Thayyal where the Raja of Chirakkal, I understand was willing to sell land. It is a pity that the honorary Labour Officer has not found time to go and see it. Apart from that, in Cannanore, there are vast lands available from the military people. I know land has been given to the shepherds and even the other people of the place have been given plots of land belonging to the Military department. If this honorary Labour Officer had only taken the pains of going round and finding out all these things, he might have made a start to give some house-sites for these depressed classes. Sir, I was told that just prior to the visit of the Labour Commissioner, he was very active in forming co-operative societies, but I may say that 90 per cent of those societies thus started are in a moribund state.

"Sir, as regards wells, I may say that not a single well has been dug in Malabar for the depressed classes. Again, in the village known as Thayyal I saw that night-soil was dumped at a distance of a few yards from the wells from which the depressed classes were taking water. Nothing has therefore been done by the Labour Officer who has been deputed specially to work for the depressed classes.

"Sir, in the year when Mr. Gopalan was appointed as honorary Labour Officer, a question was raised by Mr. Saldanha and the Government gave the reply that Mr. Gopalan was appointed because he had a knowledge of the conditions of the depressed classes. But in the report for 1925-26 it has been stated that Mr. Gopalan had been making investigations in the matter. I do not know how these two statements agree. Apart from these things, Sir, I know that he is not employing any of the Adi-Dravida teachers in the various schools, which fact is greatly retarding the educational progress of the depressed classes. In these circumstances, Sir, unless the hon. the Home Member gives us an assurance that he will appoint a permanent Labour Officer immediately or a committee consisting of a depressed class member, a responsible officer and another Member of this Legislative Council to look into the disabilities of the depressed classes, I would request every one of the Members of this House to vote with me on this matter. Malabar, as described by Swami Vivekananda, is the lunatic asylum. It is not one officer that should be sent there; but at least half a dozen paid officers have to be sent to Malabar, if the Government really mean to ameliorate the conditions of the depressed classes there. Sir, the conditions of the depressed classes in Malabar is so bad that I actually had to shed tears on seeing them; and so, I request every one of the Members to support me, and I request Government also to give a favourable reply."

\* Diwan Bahadur M. KRISHNAN NAYAR :—"Sir, I did not want to speak on this grant, but after hearing my hon. Friend Mr. Muniswami Pillai, I think I shall be failing in my duty not only to Mr. Gopalan but to the interests of the depressed classes in Malabar as a whole if I do not say one or two words on the subject.

"Sir, I know Mr. Gopalan personally, and I believe many of my comrades who were in the last Council know Mr. Gopalan very well. He was a very useful and active Member of this Council. I say that and my comrades who were in the last Council know that. My friend Mr. Muniswami Pillai hinted—I was listening to him carefully—that Mr. Gopalan himself is not a member of the depressed class. I know personally that Mr. Gopalan

28th March 1928]

[Mr. M. Krishnan Nayar]

is a member of the depressed community in Malabar. He belongs to the fishermen community and, in Malabar, members of the fishermen community have to keep themselves at a long distance from the so-called higher classes, to avoid what is called distance pollution. So, he is really a member of the depressed community.

"Mr. Muniswami Pillai went on further to say that Mr. Gopalan has no sympathy towards the members of the depressed classes. I know personally that he has considerable sympathy for them and what is more, two responsible officers, Mr. Pate, the Collector of Malabar, and Mr. Slater who is in charge of the Labour Department, have both very highly reported of the useful work that Mr. Gopalan has been doing during all these years in Malabar. One specific instance has been referred to by my friend Mr. Muniswami Pillai, viz., that no member of the depressed class has been employed as a teacher in any of the schools in Malabar by Mr. Gopalan. I know personally one instance in which Mr. Gopalan has given the appointment to a person who is a member of the depressed community. As a matter of fact, a boy who was reported to be very bright and belonging to the depressed community was brought to me by a teacher in the training school at Palghat. I did not know the boy personally, but I saw him and spoke to him and I thought he was a very intelligent boy and I recommended that boy to Mr. Gopalan. That boy was employed by Mr. Gopalan in the Perunthalamanna school, the place which my friend himself referred to.

"Then my friend has been speaking at length about the want of sympathy and about the want of activities or the inactivities of Mr. Gopalan with reference to his work. I do not know what acquaintance my friend has with my district. I was born and bred up and was educated in my district and I have practically spent my whole life there. As a matter of fact, I know from the conditions there, that Mr. Gopalan has been doing very useful work in the matter. My friend Mr. Muniswami Pillai stated that Mr. Gopalan has not been acquiring lands in Malabar for the use of the depressed classes. I do not know whether my friend knows the conditions of the Malabar district. In fact, the Government own no lands in Malabar at all. The lands, if they are to be acquired by the Government, will have to be paid for. Probably it is due to the difficulty of finding funds that lands have not been acquired in Malabar so far. It was not due to Mr. Gopalan's failure. My friend said that six or seven officers are necessary for doing this kind of work in Malabar. I fully agree with him there; but because of that, certainly it is not reasonable to take away the appointment of the one officer who is at present doing that duty. I do not want to dilate upon this point further. I have very great pleasure in supporting this demand."

\* The hon. Khan Bahadur MUHAMMAD USMAN SAHIB Bahadur:—"Sir I have nothing to add to what has been said by Diwan Bahadur Krishnan Nayar who knows the district so well. He has come in contact personally with Mr. Gopalan's work, and so I do not like to dilate upon this subject further; but I may say this, that Mr. Gopalan's work has been commended by the Collector of Malabar on more than one occasion and also by the late Sir George Paddison and Mr. Slater."

Swami A. S. Sahajanandam rose to speak.

\* The hon. the PRESIDENT:—"The hon. Member has given notice of a motion to discuss the work of District Labour Officers. He will not be in



[The President]

[28th March 1928]

order if he speaks about the unsatisfactory nature of work of the District Labour Officers in general; but he will be in order if he only refers to the work of Mr. Gopalan as District Labour Officer in Malabar."

6 p.m

Swami A. S. SAHAJANANDAM :—“மலபார் கௌரவ லேபர் ஆபிஸர்.—கனம் தலைவரவர்களே ! மலையாளத்திலுள்ள கௌரவ ஜில்லா லேபர் ஆபிஸர், ஸ்ரீ. கிருஷ்ண நாயர் அவர்கள் கூறியவண்ணம் நல்லவராயிருக்கலாம். அதைப்பற்றிக் கவலையில்லை. ஆனால் அவ்வாபிஸர் மலையாளத்திலுள்ள ஆதிராவிடர்கட்கு வேண்டிய உதவிகளைச் செய்யவில்லை. இவ்விஷயத்தை ஸ்ரீ. வி. ஐ. முனுசாமி பிள்ளையவர்கள் நேரில் சென்று பார்த்திருக்கிறார். அன்றியும் அவர் அங்கு நடைபெற்ற ஆதிராவிட மகாநாட்டில் தலைமை வகித்து, ஆதிராவிடர்களின் உள்ளவாறான குறைகளைத் தெரிந்திருக்கிறார். அவர் மேற்படி கௌரவ ஆபிஸர் நல்ல வேலை செய்யவில்லையென்று கூறுகிறார். மேற்படியார் சரியானபடி வேலை செய்யவில்லையென்று மலையாள ஆதிராவிட மகா சபையிடமிருந்து இதோ எனக்குக் கடிதமும் வந்திருக்கிறது. (என்று ஒரு கடிதத்தை சபையில் தூக்கிக் காண்பித்தார்).

“ஸ்ரீ. நாயர் அவர்களை யான் சில கேள்விகள் கேட்கிறேன். மேற்படி ஆபிஸர் மூன்று வருஷ காலமாக எத்தனை ஐக்கிய நாணய சங்கங்களை ஏற்படுத்தினார்? சுமார் பதினைந்து சபைகளிருக்குமா? அவைகளில் எத்தனை இறக்கும்துவாயிலிருக்கின்றன? எத்தனை பாடசாலைகள் வைத்தார்? எத்தனை பேருக்கு நிலம் வாங்கிக்கொடுத்தார்? எத்தனை கிணறுகள் வெட்டினார்? திட்டமாகச் சொல்லக்கூடுமா? கனம் லேபர் கமிஷனர் மலையாளம் போனபோது அவரது வேலைகளை நேரில் பார்த்தாரா? அல்லது அவர் சொல்லியபடிக்கேட்டுக்கொண்டாரா? மலையாளத்திலுள்ள ஆதிராவிட ஜன சபையார் கனம் கமிஷனார் அவர்களைப் பார்க்க வேண்டுமென கடிதங்களைழுதியிருந்தும் டெபுடேஷனாக பார்க்க முயற்சித்தும் கௌரவ ஜில்லா லேபர் ஆபிஸர் அவர்களைக் கமிஷனரைப் பார்க்கும்படிச் செய்யவில்லை. அவர் அவ்வாறு ஆதிராவிடர்களைப் பார்க்க வொட்டாமல் செய்ததின் சரியான காரணந்தானென்ன? இதனாலேயே அவரது ஊழல்கள் வெளிப்படவில்லையா? கமிஷனர் ஜில்லாக்களுக்குப் போனால் ஆபிஸர்கள் செய்யும் வேலைகளை நேரில் பார்க்கவேண்டாமா? ஏன் அவ்வாறு பார்க்கவில்லை?

“இந்த கனம் பொருத்திய சபையில் லேபர் இலாகா விஷயமாக ஒரு வண்டி கேள்விகள் கேட்டேன். சரியான பதில் கிடைக்கவில்லை.

“மலபார் டி. எல். ஓ. அவர்கட்கு சம்பளம் கொடுக்கவேண்டியது அவசியமாயின் செப்டெம்பர், அக்டோபர், மாதத்திலேயே ஏன் எழுதியனுப்பி, பட்ஜட் என்டிமேட்டில் கொண்டுவரவில்லை? இப்பொழுது உப கிராண்டில் கொண்டுவரக் காரணம் என்ன? கனம் கமிஷனார் அவர்கள் சென்ற வருடக் கடைசியில் மலையாளம் போனபோது ஆபிஸர் கமிஷனரைக் கேட்டுக்கொண்டாரா? அதன் பிறகு இந்த உபகிராண்டில் கொண்டுவர நேர்ந்ததா? இவர் கௌரவமாக மூன்று வருஷம் வேலை செய்தவரானால் இந்த ஆகஸ்ட்மீ வரை சொற்ப நாள்களில் எதற்காகச் சம்பளம் வாங்க முயலவேண்டும். முதலில் கௌரவமாக வேலைசெய்ய முன்வந்து பின்னர் சம்பளம் கேட்கலாமா? இது விஷயத்தை ஆழ்ந்து யோசிக்கவேண்டும்.”

28th March 1928]

\* Mr. N. SIVA RAJ :—" Sir, I do not presume to know the conditions in Malabar just as my friend, Mr. Muniswami Pillai or my hon. Friend Diwan Bahadur M. Krishnan Nayar does. From what I have heard, I see, that persons like me, though they cannot lay any charge against Mr. Gopalan they can neither give any credit to the good work that he is said to have done, to which reference was made by my hon. Friend Diwan Bahadur M. Krishnan Nayar. From what I gather and what I know on this subject, I think, the object of the motion is actually to bring to the notice of the Government that conditions in Malabar really require a permanent Labour Officer and that the work ought to be done not by an honorary officer who may or may not like the work, but by one who has real interest. We have always been telling the authorities concerned that if the work of the Labour department is to be started in any part of the country it ought to be started first and foremost in Malabar, which has been called the Lunatic Asylum of India. It is from this point of view that I support this motion. I do not think Mr. Muniswami Pillai will press his motion if the Government will only give an undertaking that it will appoint a permanent Labour Officer in Malabar."

\* The hon. Khan Bahadur MUHAMMAD USMAN SAHIB Bahadur :—" I am prepared to consider the question of appointing a permanent Labour Officer in Malabar."

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

\* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" The question is that Government be granted a sum not exceeding Rs. 900 under Demand XXVIII—Labour including Factories."

The demand was put and carried and the grant was made.

The hon. Sir NORMAN MARJORIBANKS :—" I move that the consideration of the remaining subjects be adjourned to to-morrow."

The hon. Dr. P. SUBBARAYAN :—" I second it."

\* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" The question is the remaining items on the agenda be adjourned to to-morrow at 11 o'clock."

The motion was put and carried.

\* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" The House will now adjourn and re-assemble to-morrow at 11 o'clock."

R. V. KRISHNA AYYAR,  
*Secretary to the Legislative Council.*